

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex libris
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS



THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

SHARED DECISION-MAKING IN THE HIGH SCHOOL

by



ELWYN RAYMOND PROBERT

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FALL, 1971

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
University of Alberta Library

<https://archive.org/details/Probert1971>

ABSTRACT

The purposes of this descriptive study were (1) to determine the decision-making sources that students, teachers and administrators collectively perceived and preferred on various school decision items; (2) to identify discrepancies in the decision-making orientations of the three groups and possible areas of conflict; (3) to identify relationships between the decision-making orientations and satisfaction levels of various groups, and (4) to compare decision-making orientations of different schools.

The data analysis progressed through four major steps: (1) Initially, preferential group bias was eliminated by using equal staff and student representation in the sample to determine the collective decision-making orientations of both groups on the Perceived and Preferred Decision-Making Subscales; (2) Member groups were compared for significant differences on the Satisfaction and Decision-Making Subscales; (3) An inter-school comparison was made, using twice as many staff as students in the sample to determine the decision-making orientations of each school; (4) Decision-Making discrepancies between different schools were further investigated by comparing similar groups in different schools and compar-

ing different member groups within each school.

The findings of the study indicated that: (1) When all three member groups are considered as potential participants in the decision-making process, the decision-making orientations of each group appear to shift to lower decision-making sources on most decision items. (2) There are negligible differences in the perceived decision-making orientations of each group but marked discrepancies between each groups' preferred decision-making orientations. (3) Student groups are the least satisfied with the school situation and express a greater desire for involvement in school decisions, than other member groups. (4) Decision items, upon which one or more member groups express marked decision-making discrepancies or high commitment, appear to have the most latent conflict potential. (5) Appropriate decision-making transitions for each school will be different and dependent upon the decision-making orientations and discrepancies of each group within a given school. (6) The most critical issues of high school administration appear to be the instructional program, the extra-curricular program and school-wide rules and regulations. Shared decision-making should be used on these more critical issues, affecting all member groups, but it should not provide a basis for personal conflict between divergent member groups.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to thank his advisor, Dr. D. Friesen, for the advice and assistance he provided throughout the preparation of this thesis. Thanks are also extended to Dr. E. A. Holdaway and Dr. K. Neufeld for their contributions as members of the thesis committee.

Finally, the writer would like to thank his wife Virginia and his typist Sharon, for their patience, understanding and support throughout the entire process of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Importance of the Study	2
Statement of the Problem	4
Definition of Terms	5
Assumptions	8
Delimitations of the Study	8
Limitations of the Study	9
Organization of the Thesis	10
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	11
Introduction	11
Decision-Making	12
Group vs. Individual Decision-Making	13
Teacher Participation in Decision-Making	15
Student Participation in Decision-Making	18
Shared Decision-Making	23
3. RESEARCH DESIGN	27
INSTRUMENTATION	27
Pilot Study	27
Personal Information Section	29
Satisfaction Subscale	29
Three Decision-Making Subscales	29
Reliability and Validity of the Instrument	31
SAMPLE AND DATA COLLECTION	33
Sample	33
Data Collection	33
DATA ANALYSIS	37
Decision-Making Orientations of the Total Sample	37

Inter-Group Comparison of the Three Groups on the Decision- Making and Satisfaction Sub- scales	38
Inter-School Comparison of Similar Groups on the Decision- Making and Satisfaction Sub- scales	39
Intra-School Comparison of Dif- ferent Member Groups within a School	40
SUMMARY	40
4. DECISION-MAKING ORIENTATIONS OF ADMINISTRATORS, TEACHERS AND STUDENTS	42
PERCEIVED DECISION-MAKING ORIENTATIONS	42
Perceived Administrator-Oriented Decisions	43
Perceived Teacher-Oriented Deci- sions	46
Perceived Student-Oriented Deci- sions	47
Perceived Shared Decisions	47
PREFERRED DECISION-MAKING ORIENTATIONS	50
Preferred Administrator-Oriented Decisions	50
Preferred Teacher-Oriented Deci- sions	53
Preferred Student-Oriented Deci- sions	56
Preferred Shared Decisions	58
DIFFERENT DECISION-MAKING ORIENTATIONS OF ADMINIS- TRATORS, TEACHERS AND STUDENTS	59

Chapter	Page
Differences in the Perceived Decision-Making Orientations of the Three Groups	60
Differences in the Preferred Decision-Making Orientations of the Three Groups	62
Differences in the Intended Decision-Making Orientations of the Three Groups	67
SATISFACTION ORIENTATIONS OF ADMINISTRATORS, TEACHERS AND STUDENTS	79
Satisfaction and Decision-Making	80
SUMMARY	82
5. DECISION-MAKING ORIENTATIONS OF ADMINISTRATORS, TEACHERS AND STUDENTS IN DIFFERENT SCHOOLS	84
DECISION-MAKING ORIENTATIONS OF DIFFERENT SCHOOLS	85
Perceived and Preferred Decision- Making Orientations of Different Schools	86
Intended Decision-Making Orienta- tions of Similar Groups from Different Schools	96
Different Perceived and Preferred Decision-Making Orientations of Similar Groups from Different Schools	108
Comparison of Satisfaction Levels of Similar Groups from Different Schools	115
DECISION-MAKING DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN DIFFERENT GROUPS WITHIN EACH SCHOOL	120

DECISION-MAKING WITHIN SCHOOL A	121
Perceived Decision-Making Dis-	
crepancies of Groups within	
School A	121
Preferred Decision-Making Dis-	
crepancies of Groups within	
School A	121
Intended Decision-Making Dis-	
crepancies of Groups within	
School A	131
Satisfaction Discrepancies of	
Groups within School A	133
DECISION-MAKING WITHIN SCHOOL B	135
Perceived Decision-Making Dis-	
crepancies of Groups within	
School B	135
Preferred Decision-Making Dis-	
crepancies of Groups within	
School B	145
Intended Decision-Making Dis-	
crepancies of Groups within	
School B	147
Satisfaction Discrepancies of	
Groups within School B	148
DECISION-MAKING WITHIN SCHOOL C	149
Perceived Decision-Making Dis-	
crepancies of Groups within	
School C	149
Preferred Decision-Making Dis-	
crepancies of Groups within	
School C	154
Intended Decision-Making Dis-	
crepancies of Groups within	
School C	161
Satisfaction Discrepancies of	
Groups within School C	163
SUMMARY	163

Chapter	Page
6. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICA- TIONS	167
SUMMARY	167
The Problem and Subproblems	167
Related Literature	168
Research Design	170
Findings	172
CONCLUSIONS	175
Perceived and Preferred Decision-Making Sources	175
Intended Decision-Making Commitments	176
Satisfaction Levels	177
Critical Issues of School Administration	178
Participatory Groups in Decision-Making	178
Decision-Making Discrepancies between Schools	179
IMPLICATIONS	180
SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	182
REFERENCES	184
APPENDIX A	191
APPENDIX B	209

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Description of the Sample by Sex, Age and Marital Status	34
2. Description of the Sample by Work Hours and Formal Education	35
3. Percentage Frequencies of the Total Sample on the Perceived Subscale with regard to Administrator- Oriented Decisions	44
4. Percentage Frequencies of the Total Sample on the Perceived Subscale with regard to Teacher-Oriented Decisions	46
5. Percentage Frequencies of the Total Sample on the Perceived Subscale with regard to Student-Oriented Decisions	48
6. Percentage Frequencies of the Total Sample on the Perceived Subscale with regard to Shared Decisions	49
7. Percentage Frequencies of the Total Sample on the Preferred Subscale with regard to Administrator- Oriented Decisions	52
8. Percentage Frequencies of the Total Sample on the Preferred Subscale with regard to Teacher-Oriented Decisions	55
9. Percentage Frequencies of the Total Sample on the Preferred Subscale with regard to Student-Oriented Decisions	57
10. Percentage Frequencies of the Total Sample on the Preferred Subscale with regard to Shared Decisions	59

Table	Page
11. Decision Items, Exhibiting a Significant Difference between the Perceived Decision-Making Orientations of Administrators, Teachers and Students	61
12. Decision Items, Exhibiting a Significant Difference between the Preferred Decision-Making Orientations of Administrators, Teachers and Students	63
13. Comparison of the Means and Percentage Frequencies of Administrators, Teachers and Students on the Intended Decision-Making Subscale	69
14. Administrator, Teacher and Student Rankings in Accordance with Their Mean Scores attained on the Intended Decision-Making Subscale	74
15. Intended Decision-Making Groups for Decision Items Ranked by the Three Groups on the Intended Decision-Making Subscale	76
16. Percentage Frequencies and Mean Scores of Administrators, Teachers and Students on the Satisfaction Subscale	81
17. Categorization of the Percentage Frequencies of Each School Sample with regard to Their Decision-Making Orientations on the Three Subscales	87
18. Number of Decision Items Allotted to the Different Decision-Making Orientations by Members of each School	95
19. Mean Scores on Decision Items of the Intended Decision-Making Subscale Ranked by Teachers and Students at School A	97

Table

Page

20.	Mean Scores on Decision Items of the Intended Decision-Making Subscale Ranked by Teachers and Students at School B	98
21.	Mean Scores on Decision Items of the Intended Decision-Making Subscale Ranked by Teachers and Students at School C	99
22.	Decision Items, Exhibiting a Sig- nificant Difference between Stu- dents of Different Schools on the Intended Decision-Making Subscale	102
23.	Comparison of High Priority Deci- sion Items of Teachers and Stu- dents at Different Schools	104
24.	Number of Decision Items that Groups Intend to Commit Extra Time Towards on the Intended Decision-Making Sub- scale	107
25.	Significant Differences between Tea- chers of the Three Schools on the Perceived and Preferred Subscales, with regard to Various Decision Items	109
26.	Significant Differences between Stu- dents of the Three Schools on the Perceived and Preferred Subscales, with regard to Various Decision Items	112
27.	Percentage Frequencies and Mean Scores of Teachers from Different Schools on the Satisfaction Subscale	117
28.	Percentage Frequencies and Mean Scores of Students from Different Schools on the Satisfaction Subscale	118

Table	Page
29. Decision Items Showing a Significant Difference between Administrators, Teachers and Students at School A	122
30. Categorization of the Percentage Frequencies of Each Group at School A with regard to Their Decision-Making Orientations on the Three Subscales	125
31. Percentage Frequencies and Mean Scores of Teachers and Students from School A on the Satisfaction Subscale	134
32. Decision Items Showing a Significant Difference between Administrators, Teachers and Students at School B	136
33. Categorization of the Percentage Frequencies of Each Group at School B with regard to Their Decision-Making Orientations on the Three Subscales	139
34. Percentage Frequencies and Mean Scores of Teachers and Students from School B on the Satisfaction Subscale	150
35. Decision Items Showing a Significant Difference between Administrators, Teachers and Students at School C	151
36. Categorization of the Percentage Frequencies of Each Group at School C with regard to Their Decision-Making Orientations on the Three Subscales	155
37. Percentage Frequencies and Mean Scores of Teachers and Students from School C on the Satisfaction Subscale	164
38. Percentage Distributions of Administrators, Teachers and Students on the Perceived Subscale	210

Table

Page

39. Percentage Distributions of Adminis- trators, Teachers and Students on the Preferred Subscale	214
---	-----

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

If the school is to successfully implement its programs and policies for an increasingly concerned clientele, it may require a wider base of involvement in educational decisions. This wider base of involvement in decision-making has been denoted by many educators as shared decision-making.

There is increasing evidence that decision-making is a functional process, dependent upon (1) the level of competence of the decision-maker, (2) the scrutiny of those affected by the decisions, and (3) the degree of member participation in the process. This viewpoint introduces the concept of reciprocity between shared decision-making and accountability, where the participants of the decision-making process are held accountable by those groups affected by any decision.

To debate the merits of shared decision-making and its application within a school requires a careful study of the involved groups, their motives, and conflicts. Shared decision-making is most effective amongst groups with an authentic commitment to a mutual problem and its

subsequent resolution (Halpin, 1958). Capricious and conflicting desires of different groups have caused many educators to make inappropriate decisions (Bridges, 1969:15). A more diagnostic approach is needed to separate ulterior motives from authentic concerns, if shared decision-making involving various groups is to be implemented.

This study made an analysis of the perceived, preferred and intended decision-making patterns of administrators, teachers and students.

Importance of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine which mode of decision-making; unilateral, partially-shared, or shared, is presently being utilized in the schools and which form of decision-making is preferred in the schools. It is anticipated that one of the consequences of this study might be to alleviate some of the forced reactions to crisis situations and encourage a more flexible and amenable approach to various pressure groups, within the school.

This study was an extension of previous research involving the analysis of opinions of either staff or students with regard to their perceived and preferred decision-making processes. This study simultaneously analyzed the opinions of three groups in an attempt to establish a com-

posite picture of the decision-making perceptions and preferences of the three groups. It has extended the previous two decision-making dimensions and added an intended decision-making subscale in an attempt to establish the degree of commitment, time, or energy each group is willing to devote to the decision-making process. By simultaneously analyzing each group's perceived and preferred decision-making orientations, in conjunction with each group's degree of commitment to various school issues a more complete picture of the decision-making process may result.

Many prominent educators believe the present turmoil in education is attributable to the continual confrontation that exists between the three groups within the school, and each group's thrust for a greater control of the decision-making processes that affect their lives. Hodgkinson (1970: 550) intimates his concern about this turmoil by stating, "Some way must be found whereby individuals can participate more meaningfully in decision-making that governs their own lives." Bridges (1968:50) is more concerned with the decision-making of the principal and teacher, where he ascribes to the belief that the most crucial activity of the principal is "his conscious involvement of teachers in making decisions." Other educators, like Mark Chesler, are more concerned with student decision-making. Chesler

(1970:9) states that, "A primary issue today is how to help create systems of shared power with greater student decision-making in secondary schools." To indicate more amenable decision-making processes for the three groups would be one of the most significant contributions this study could make.

Statement of the Problem

This study investigated the perceived, preferred and intended participation of administrators, teachers and students in the decision-making processes of their high schools.

Specifically, the study was categorized with respect to the following eight subproblems:

(1) What decision-making sources do students, teachers and administrators collectively perceive and prefer on school decision items?

(2) What differences exist between the decision-making orientations of the three groups on the Perceived, Preferred and Intended Decision-Making Subscales?

(3) What decision-making conflicts can be observed from the perceived, preferred and intended decision-making orientations of administrators, teachers and students?

(4) What relationship exists between the different

decision-making orientations of the three groups and their satisfaction levels?

(5) What differences exist in the perceived, preferred and intended decision-making orientations in different schools?

(6) What relationship exists between different school decision-making orientations and member group satisfaction?

(7) What differences exist between the perceived, preferred and intended decision-making orientations of member groups, within a school?

(8) What are some of the conflict decision items in a school?

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are maintained throughout this study.

Decision - is used in the broadest sense to denote a gradual commitment to a course of action, including the activities preliminary to and following choice as well as the choice itself. (Pondy, 1967). Decision-making will be considered as a process accredited to the most important group/s involved in a course of action on various decision items.

Unilateral Decisions - are those decisions accredited to a single group or individual.

Partially Shared Decisions - are those decisions accredited to any paired combination of the three groups.

Shared Decisions - are those decisions shared equally by all three groups.

Administrator-Oriented Decisions - are those decisions accredited to all possible combinations of the three groups involving the administrators.

Teacher-Oriented Decisions - are those decisions accredited to all possible combinations of the three groups involving the teachers.

Student-Oriented Decisions - are those decisions accredited to all possible combinations of the three groups involving the students.

High Level Decisions - are those decisions accredited to the administrative (A) or administrative-teacher personnel (A-T).

Low Level Decisions - are those decisions accredited to either the A-S, A-T-S, T-S, T or S decision-making groups.

Perceived Decision-Making - refers to that type of decision-making that group members in the school believe is being used at present.

Preferred Decision-Making - refers to that type of

decision-making that group members in the school believe should be utilized.

Intended Decision-Making - refers to that amount of time and energy any group is willing to commit to a decision item, in addition to their present work commitments.

Conflict - is a state of disorder involving the preliminary stages of manifest conflict, such as, the antecedent conditions of conflict, individual awareness of differences and affective states of tension (Pondy, 1967:299).

Latent Conflict - is an implied form of conflict, often recognized by the symptoms that create (1) competition for scarce resources, (2) drives for autonomy, (3) divergence of subunit goals, or (4) role conflict.

Perceived Conflict - cognitive differences of which two groups may or may not be mutually aware.

Felt Conflict - the affective personalization of conflict, arising from inconsistent organizational and individual demands or extra-organizational pressures.

Group Satisfaction - is the perceived positive inclination of a group towards their occupational role, school climate and personnel within the school structure.

Self-Image - is the personal assessment of one's

feelings and emotions about himself.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made in this study:

(1) High and low levels of decision-making in the school can be attained by selecting the most frequently occurring decision-making combinations of the three groups. The level of decision-making can be attributed to the predominant decision-making authority in the selected combinations.

(2) The respondents had sufficient knowledge and reliable perceptions about which groups participate in the decision-making processes of their school.

(3) The responses to the instrument are valid measures of the variables involved in this study.

(4) The descriptive approach, using no hypotheses, seemed most appropriate for the decision-making patterns of this study. The use of nominal response categories on some subscales required the use of low-powered statistical tests, which were used to substantiate some of the various decision-making distributions.

Delimitations of the Study

The study was delimited in the following ways:

(1) The study was restricted to three groups, ad-

ministrators, teachers and student governments within three senior high schools of the Edmonton Public School District.

(2) Administrators, in the study, included all principals, vice-principals, and assistant principals in the schools.

(3) The student group was represented by Student Council members from each school. It was assumed that they might have a greater insight into the decision-making processes of their school than a random sample of students.

(4) A random sample of teachers was used to represent the teacher group from each school.

(5) The study was restricted to school issues that administrators, teachers, and students felt were, or could be, contentious decision items in the senior high school.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations apply to the findings of this study:

(1) The findings of this study are limited to the population involved and generalizations to other schools or school systems cannot be made.

(2) Because of the small number of administrators and student government members in each school, all members from these two groups were used in the study.

Organization of the Thesis

In this chapter a general introduction is given about the nature and importance of the study, the problem and subproblems are presented, critical terms are defined and the assumptions, delimitations and limitations are described.

Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature and research related to this study.

Chapter 3 presents the research design and methodology involved in the study. This chapter includes a discussion of the pilot study, the instrumentation, the population studied, data collection procedures and methods of data analysis.

Chapters 4 and 5 present the findings of the study and the statistical evidence upon which they are based. Chapter 4 pertains to the first four subproblems, and the last four subproblems are examined in Chapter 5.

Chapter 6 summarizes the study and provides conclusions and implications and suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Who should make the decisions in the senior high school? This question has been the focal point of many power struggles between groups within the school, not to mention the pressures exerted by many groups external to the school organization. In a democracy, one cannot rule out the relevant importance of political influence in decision-making. Historically, many justifiable and impartial decisions have been made in an atmosphere of democratic controversy. In the democratic setting the question seems more relevant when one asks, how can decision-making be made more amenable to all those groups affected by a particular decision?

Former concepts of school administration contended that the principal was "captain of the ship," and decision-making was a "line function" delegated to the principal by a central-office administration (Campbell, et al, 1962). Many educators believe that recent teacher and student militancies are undermining this line of control. Teachers and students are demanding a voice in decisions that affect

them. Campbell, et al (1962:220) express the views of many educators when they state:

The modern concept of administration rejects the idea that the administrator is "the boss" who makes decisions for the group, and it will not condone the paternalistic attitude of the administrator who through his kindly and fatherly wisdom and maturity makes decisions for the welfare of the group.

Decision-Making

Decision-making is probably the most crucial process in school administration. Many educators feel it is the essence of administration (Griffiths, 1959). Should all groups, which have an interest in a decision, be given the option of participating in the making of that decision? Will participation, necessarily, improve the quality of the ensuing decisions? Can an individual make quality decisions that are appropriate for the majority of groups and individuals? These questions will be resolved by each administrator, in accordance with his personal values, beliefs, competence and self-assurance, using one of two techniques:

(1) The decision can be delegated to a broad decision-making base, involving the concerned individuals, commonly called shared decision-making.

(2) The decision can be made by an individual such as the administrator or some other competent individual the administrator feels is reliable.

The nature of the task, the kind of organization and the types of individuals involved in the decision-making process are quite often the most influential factors in determining which one of the two decision-making techniques will be used by an administrator. Each problem situation demands a slightly different decision-making technique, sometimes, a slight alteration or compromise between individual and group decision-making. Milton (1965:301) mentions that there has been a popular trend in recent years toward group or shared decision-making. Can this trend be substantiated?

Group vs. Individual Decision-Making

The superiority of groups over individuals, in certain types of tasks, is attested to by Blau and Scott (1962): (1) the sifting of suggestions in social interaction serves as an error-correcting mechanism; (2) the social support furnished in interaction facilitates thinking; and (3) the competition among members for respect mobilizes their energies for contributing to the task. Collins and Guetzhaw (1964:52) attribute the superiority of group decision-making to the additional resources and judgment offered by the group: (1) the group will have access to more extensive resources than an individual member; and (2) group products will frequently be superior because the pooling of individual judgments eliminates random error. This viewpoint is sup-

ported by Osborn (1957) who claims that the "average person can think up twice as many ideas when working with the group as working alone." Shaw (1932:491-504) seems to attest to the better judgment of groups when he concluded that incorrect suggestions were often made within the groups and then rejected. The superiority of group decision-making is summarized by Bridges, et al (1968:305-319):

It is not easy for an individual to detect mistakes in his thinking. He brings a set perspective to the problem-solving situation, which militates against his seeing the problem from another perspective. When a number of individuals are working on a common task, the chances that an error in thinking will be detected are increased, because the other people bring different assumptions, frames of reference, experiences, and knowledge to bear on the problem.

Not all the research seems to acknowledge the superiority of group decision-making. Taylor, Berry and Block (1958:23-47) showed that group participation apparently retained inhibiting qualities even in brainstorming situations. They found that "with respect to the number of unique responses the nominal groups (individuals) were superior to the real groups in all three problems of the study." Lorge, et al (1958:348) contended that the judgment of groups is not always superior, "At best, group judgment equals the best individual judgment but usually is somewhat inferior to the judgment of the best individual." Quite often, in group decision-making the members feel in-

hibited and restrained (Dashiell, 1935:1097-1158) and, as a result, make fewer personal associations (decisions) and more popular associations (Allport, 1920:152-182). Riechen (1958:309-321) added further doubt to the quality of group decision-making when he found that the elegant solution was rarely adopted by a group when its proponent was the least talkative member of the group, but was almost always adopted when he was the most talkative member.

A review of the literature doesn't seem to add any conclusive support for the advantages of shared decision-making over individual decision-making. The group vs. individual decision-making controversy may no longer be a problem for academics but a constitutional problem where the interests of a few individuals are opposing the rights of large groups. The most compelling force behind group decision-making is probably the political proposition that in free societies all those affected by a social policy have an inalienable right to a voice in its formulation (McGrath, 1970:51). This democratic principle, more than any other motive, may be what is compelling both teachers and students to seek increased participation in school decision-making.

Teacher-Participation in Decision-Making

Educators feel that if the degree of teacher-

community satisfaction is to be improved then the teachers should seek greater participation in community and educational decision-making (Knill, 1967:20). Kowalski and Knill (1966:105) contend that:

Teachers must not only be cognizant of the process of decision-making, but even more important, they must find a means of influencing community decision-makers. It would appear that the activity of teachers in community affairs along with their social contacts are potentially relevant factors in the community power equation.

Bridges (1967:49) asserts that it is one of the most crucial activities of a principal to consciously involve his teachers in the decision-making process. The findings of Bridges seem to substantiate the theories of Allport (1954:45) on positive attitude formation with increasing need-satisfying independence, of Argyris (1957) on the need for independence and self-actualization, and of Strauss (1963:62) on participation as a form of power equalization. Bridges (1964) qualifies the positive relationship between extending member participation in decision-making and increasing member satisfaction by stating:

Teachers with a high need for independence consistently expressed less favorable attitudes towards the principal than did teachers with a low need for independence, regardless of the extent of participation and/or support.

Token participation of teachers in decision-making may not fulfill the need for independence of the more auton-

omous teachers, seeking participation in the decisions that affect their performance. As Corwin (1965:242) points out ". . . decisions are often made in consultation with teachers; but consultation is not authority to decide, and decision is the crux of professional authority." The antithetical relationship between the professionalism of teachers and hierarchical supervision has created internal conflict for almost all types of organizations employing professional personnel. Ratsoy (1968:14) predicts an increase in the professionalism-supervision conflict of teachers in the near future. Different modes of reconciliation have been proposed, by educators, to ameliorate the discrepancies between hierarchical control and teacher-professionalism, ranging from completely autonomous staff cabinets (Schmuck, 1969:97) to administrator-oriented school control (Vars, 1968:166-175).

The principal will be a key figure, no matter what type of decision-making is adopted, and he may either facilitate or hinder a decision-making transition. Future decision-making orientations in the schools is open to question. However, a major question is whether educators will be reluctantly pulled into the new organizational form or become instrumental in developing it.

Student Participation in Decision-Making

Educators believe the quest for democratic decision-making, that is responsible for increased teacher militancy, is also the force behind student demands for increased participation in decisions that affect them. Many studies have researched the power struggles of administrators and teachers, ignoring the emergent power and political ascendance of students. Triezenberg (1971:62) reminds educators that:

Time after time in the last decade school administrators and teachers have learned all too well and sometimes with great embarrassment and humiliation that roles are reversed. Students are teaching them about rights and proving to be hard task-masters.

In the last decade students have acquired considerable decision-making authority in almost all colleges and high schools. They are represented on many faculty committees exercising the same rights as staff members. Administrators and teachers have underestimated the political power the student wields as a constituent-link with the community. This misunderstanding of many administrators Ackerley (1971:2) feels has caused much of the present conflict in education:

. . . principals remain primarily responsive not to the student, but to elected school boards and legislatures, to the community, to the parents, to public opinion.

Willis (1968:484) contends that the "in loco parentis"

principle is outdated and responsible for many of the misguided practices being used by teachers and administrators. He asserts that educators are not parents and cannot arbitrarily act as parents do, when the situation warrants it. Students, especially at the high school level, are constituents demanding many of the same civil rights as adults. The failure of educators to recognize the democratic rights and acquired political finesse of students has given students cause to search for specific faults in the educational system:

Because of the increasing power struggles between groups within the school and a lack of cooperative decision-making, there may be a growing lack of accountability and poor human relations between the member groups within schools. If group-conflict is allowed to continue the divergence between the groups may increase in accordance with the old political axiom; as more groups compete for attention in decision-making, consensus amongst various groups will decline, political conflict will increase, and decision-making authority will flow towards the centres of power. McGrath (1970:80) feels this has already happened in some schools and campuses:

Hence a deep-seated conflict exists on campuses today between a minority which, frustrated by earlier failures to achieve reform, now feels it necessary to replace reason and persuasion with unreason and coercion,

and the majority which believes that the necessary changes can still be accomplished through restructured government in which parliamentary debate and majority decision will prevail.

Students often find the present educational system has an irrelevant content and non-motivating teaching methods. It has been proposed by some educators that students sitting on curriculum committees, advisory boards and evaluative committees would improve the present qualities and standards of education. With regard to curriculum, McKenna (1970:57) contends that:

Both the identification of meaningful content and the development of broad-fields curricula will require more planning together of staff, students, and parents. . . Perhaps core curriculum was a good idea after all - an idea whose time had not arrived when it was supposed to be in its heyday--but an idea whose time may now be upon us.

McGrath (1970:58) feels that the most persuasive argument for increasing student participation in academic government rests on the subsequent improvement of instruction:

Students have certain experiences which qualify them to make more reliable judgments than their associates among the trustees, administrators, or faculty members. . . Students are peculiarly situated to make judgments concerning the faculty members' performance in discharging his responsibilities in the classroom. Since custom, if not ethics, prevents all others from viewing the instructional situation, students are the only group capable of gathering the relevant facts.

Another barrier which students have felt hindered educational reform is the trivial concerns of many status-quo

conscious school personnel. Quite often, educators lack the necessary risk-taking qualities that are necessary to promote change. In a study involving 100 principals, Gorton (1970:129) found that principals were reluctant to let teachers participate in decisions external to the classroom. The Havighurst Committee (1970) in a survey of large city high schools, found that 43% of the students were concerned about dress and appearance regulations. It appears that many students and teachers are struggling to attain some token of participation in the decisions that affect them.

Many administrators, teachers and students feel that increased student participation in school decision-making is synonymous with greater student permissiveness and loss of pupil control. Control can be either external (established rights of the ruling group) or internal (form of self-discipline appealing to a person's sense of right or wrong). In schools, where the students are not members by personal choice and where they have not been selected by the organization (Friesen, 1967:62), both forms of control are attempted. Most educators feel internal control is too idealistic and external control is too demeaning. Many educators have relinquished their external controls, only to find that the critics of internal control appear

to be right. However, the proponents of internal control still hypothesize, as Willower (1965:42-43) does, that external control is inversely related to the school-client attraction and directly related to displacement of instructional goals. A more reasonable approach to student discipline would seem to incorporate the attributes of both forms of control, by making students, teachers and administrators participants (internal control) in the formulation of explicit student body regulations (external control). The advice of a high school principal, George Triezenberg (1971:67) seems to attest to this viewpoint:

Make certain that reasonable rules and regulations are clear to students, parents and staff. Better yet, involve all these groups in the formulation of rules. Do not be reluctant to include students. . . . They are likely to be less permissive than the staff. It is most desirable to reduce these regulations to writing and ensure maximum distribution and discussion for clarity of understanding.

It appears that if student responsibility is to become a reality, then the student should neither be regimented into a program where he is constantly supervised and directed, nor should he be treated as a client with absolute freedom to resolve his own problems, when he may be incapable of implementing self-directive resolutions. Even under the guidance of the most capable leaders and facilitators, such strategies seem to be

illogical allegories, incapable of bringing about student responsibility. An alternative to these two approaches is to treat the student as a constituent, with a reciprocal responsibility to his group and community members, capable of linking the school and society and having potential which can be utilized and developed by the staff to improve both the liaison and resources of the school and society. If the constituents can be shown both the intrinsic and utility values of the school programs, then the liaison of the school and society may not be such a contentious issue. Quite often a loss of the constituent from school-involvement, encourages a separation of the school from the constituents' society, and a possible conflict between these two networks.

Shared Decision-Making

There seems to be little doubt that the hierarchical bureaucracy of school systems is starting to break down. The rise of teacher militancy and increased community participation in the schools form two powerful presses that have begun to weaken the freedom that administrators have to make unilateral decisions. There seem to be differences, however, in the overall goals of the teacher militancy-community participation strategies and the participative-collaborative (strategy).

This statement by Blumberg, et al (1969:42) reiterates the teacher-community rift and the problems this presents when trying to share the decision-making between these two groups. The divergent needs of students, as con-

stituents, is quite often symbolic of the pluralistic demands of their community. To differentiate "needs-as-felt" from the "needs-as-stated" in a pluralistic group requires the most insightful administrator. Bridges (1969:15) warns administrators about this dilemma:

If the administrator in search of an alternative which is acceptable to his subordinates mistakes the surface complaint as the basic need-as-felt, then he will quite likely overlook the necessity for probing beneath the surface for the fundamental goal that initiated the subordinates' action.

The onerous tasks of differentiating the needs of different groups and performing the increasing administrative duties in schools may require a broader base of informants and participants, than any administrative hierarchy can provide. Argyris (1957) noted that the tasks of executives were far too onerous and pressurized for a few administrators to control. He recommended a broader base of member involvement in almost all organizations.

Preferential involvement of one group in decision-making, excluding other groups that may be affected by a decision, can be as detrimental to an organization as the present administrative patriarchies and former student oligarchies (McGrath, 1970:9-13). McGrath (1970:48) substantiates this position by stating:

The collegial model of academic organization, which faculties favor, . . . may indeed involve faculty members in all decision-making processes,

and thus it may have considerable merit as far as it goes, but it betrays a curious blindness and inconsistency. It leaves basic institutional policy in the hands of a corpus of professionals who, like all other human beings, are largely moved by self-interest. It greatly curtails the role of boards of trustees and administrative officers, and it reduces students, the persons for whose education the collegial community supposedly exists, to customers, who merely buy what is offered.

He then concludes by stating (McGrath, 1970:92):

The basic plank in the new academic political platform ought to be the idea that the dominant mission of the institution is the advancement of education, not the enhancement and strengthening of party groups.

To avoid preferential group involvement and divergence of party groups, numerous educators are turning to shared decision-making as the panacea for all organizational ailments. However, as Oliva (1968:52) warns:

The techniques of decision-making which are best in one situation may not necessarily be best in another. Obviously, the degree of staff involvement in decision-making processes will vary from school to school, or school system to school system, depending on such factors as the desired student learnings, the competence of the staff, the leadership style of the administrator, and that highly intangible quality - the intensity of the desire of each teacher and administrator to make decisions which are in the best interests of all students.

In schools of even moderate size it is impossible to involve everyone in decision-making all the time. There are also decisions that must be made continuously, requiring the competencies and expertise of trained professionals. One

must think beyond the theory of participation and ask whether the time and effort of numerous committees merit our involvement (MacKinnon, 1970:157). Many administrators are forming committees to give member groups in the school a sense of participation. This form of "infiltration-up," MacKinnon (1970:158) says, is not meeting the basic needs of individual group members of identity, initiative, privacy and relevance. He states that, "Shifting (real power) down will meet more needs of the teachers (member groups) and at the same time assist necessary administrative pruning." Consequently, shared decision-making comes in numerous disguises and varies from one school to another. Because of the numerous varieties of shared decision-making it seems more pertinent to recognize when to use some form of shared decision-making, rather than attempting to give a definitive description of shared decision-making. A statement by Hodgkinson (1969:41) seems to be a helpful guideline for shared decision-making:

The ideal to shoot for would be a system in which decisions affecting individuals' lives and commitments would be made in the smallest possible units, while matters of logistics and support services should be made in the largest context available, tapping into the national network.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN

INSTRUMENTATION

The instrument used in this study was entitled Shared Decision-Making Questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed to investigate the participation that administrators, teachers and students desire in various decision items concerning their high school. Decision items, in the questionnaire, were gleaned from various field personnel, the researcher's personal experiences as a student union coordinator, and former researchers (Halpin and Croft, Simpkins, Hawley and Clarke). There are five sections to the instrument; first, the personal information section; second, the Satisfaction Subscale; third, the Perceived Decision-Making Subscale, fourth, the Preferred Decision-Making Subscale; and fifth, the Intended Decision-Making Subscale. A copy of the instrument is provided in Appendix A. The remainder of this section explains the development of the questionnaire.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted to check the phrasing

of items, adequacy of various response categories and the general format of the questionnaire. The pilot study was conducted in an urban high school of 1200 students and 62 teachers. There were four administrators, a random sample of eighteen teachers and twenty-nine student council members involved in the pilot study. After the pilot study, the following modifications were made to the questionnaire:

(1) The original forty decision items on each of the three decision-making subscales (Perceived, Preferred and Intended) were reduced to thirty items. Those items which seemed to be trivial, redundant or beyond the authority of any of the three decision-making groups were deleted.

(2) The original time scale on the Intended Subscale was reduced from 0 hrs. - 5 hrs., to 0 hrs - 2 1/2 hrs., because many respondents in the pilot study felt the original time scale was too extensive to indicate an individuals' degree of commitment to a particular decision item.

(3) An eighth response category, not applicable (N/A), was added to the Perceived Subscale for those individuals who felt the item did not apply to their school or they did not have sufficient knowledge to pass judgment on the item.

(4) Minor changes were made in the sentence structure and format of some items.

Personal Information Section

This section determined the sex, age, marital status, formal education and hours of work per week for all respondents. A description of this information is contained in Tables 1 and 2.

Satisfaction Subscale

This subscale contained six Likert-type items measuring each group's satisfaction with (1) students, (2) teachers, (3) administrators, (4) their work progress, (5) school climate and (6) their self-image. Each respondent was asked to select one of six possible responses for each item, ranging from highly satisfied to highly dissatisfied. Higher scores indicated higher satisfaction and vice-versa.

Three Decision-Making Subscales

Each of the decision-making subscales contained the same thirty decision items and individual responses to the items were considered representative of either the school or group under study. For each decision item on the Perceived and Preferred Subscales, the respondent could choose any one of the following possible decision-making combinations between the three groups: A (Administrator/s), A-T (Administrator and Teacher), A-S (Administrator and Student), A-T-S (Administrator, Teacher and Student or Shared Decision-

Making), T-S (Teacher and Student), T (Teacher/s) and S (Student/s). The groups involved in the Shared (A-T-S) and Partially Shared (A-T, A-S and T-S) decision-making groups were considered to have equal decision-making authority. Decision-making orientations of different groups were determined by the response patterns of the respondents on various decision items. For example, if the majority of respondents felt that the A, A-T, A-S and A-T-S decision-making groups were most influential in making a particular decision, then that decision was considered a high level decision, predominantly administrator-oriented. Those decisions which were considered shared decisions had at least fifty percent of the total sample select the A-T-S response.

Perceived Decision-Making Subscale. This scale was designed to ascertain which groups actually did participate in the decision-making processes of their school on various decision items. This subscale contained the seven aforementioned decision-making response combinations of the three groups for each decision item and an eighth response category of N/A (Not Applicable) was added for those individuals who did not have sufficient knowledge to pass judgment on an item or where the item was not applicable to their particular school.

Preferred Decision-Making Subscale. This scale was

designed to ascertain which groups should participate in the decision-making processes of their school on various decision items. This subscale contained the aforementioned seven responses as possible decision-making groups for each of the thirty decision items.

Intended Decision-Making Subscale. This scale was designed to ascertain which groups would be willing to participate in decision-making in addition to their present work commitments. Each respondent was asked to indicate the number of hours per week (0 hrs., 1/2 hr., 1 hr., 1 1/2 hrs., 2 hrs., or 2 1/2 hrs.) they were willing to commit to the decision-making of each of the thirty decision items in addition to their present work commitments. If the item was already a part of their regular duties, they were asked to indicate zero hours. This subscale was designed to determine the more critical decision items of each group and the concerted time allotted by each group to the resolution of various decision items. It is anticipated that this subscale will act as an extension of the Perceived and Preferred Subscales carrying the decision-making process beyond the "who does" and "who should" phases to the "who will" phase.

Reliability and Validity of the Instrument

Many researchers feel the reliability and validity tests for survey research are inconsequential because of

the temporal nature of most of the data. Horst (1966:278) mentions that reliability tests of test-retest measures are difficult to use in different situations over a time period. One measure of reliability in this study was carried out by determining the Pearson-S contingency coefficients for the three groups in the pilot study and the final study on all thirty decision items of each decision-making subscale. The contingency coefficients for the three groups, between each study, ranged from .25 to .98, with the majority of correlations being greater than .70. The index of reliability established by this short term (four weeks) test-retest method may appear quite significant but would undoubtedly be lower over a longer period of time.

The validity of measuring group responses by the summation of group member's responses is a technique that has been used by many former researchers (Halpin, Hemphill, Stodghill and Simpkins). Simpkins (1968:118), using Ahma Vaara's mathematical theory of factorial invariance, noted that two random teacher group perceptions of decision items on the Perceived and Preferred Subscales had a high enough correlation to warrant the use of individual teacher responses as representative of the teacher group.

When compared with former research on decision-making, the obtained measures of consistency and validity

seem to provide adequate evidence of reliability and validity for the instrument.

SAMPLE AND DATA COLLECTION

Sample

This study was conducted in the Edmonton Public School District, involving three high schools having between 1100 and 1500 students. These schools were designated as School A, School B and School C. The schools were similar in operational philosophies and procedures, except School B, which was introducing an individualized instructional program. Also, School B was in its first year of operation. All the administrators, all student government members and a random sample of one-half of the teachers were involved in the study. A summary of the sex, age, marital status, formal education, and the work hours per week is given for each group and school in Tables 1 and 2.

Data Collection

Questionnaires were distributed personally by the researcher to the principal and Student Union coordinator of each school about midway through the school year. The principals accepted the responsibility of distributing and collecting the questionnaires from all administrators and

Table 1

Description of Sample by Sex, Age and Marital Status
(N=168)

Group	Sex		Age					Marital Status		
	M	F	14-21	22-29	30-37	38-45	46-53	S	M	Other
<u>Administrators</u>										
School A (n=2)	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-
School B (n=4)	4	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	4	-
School C (n=3)	3	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	3	-
TOTAL (n=9)	9				4	2	1		9	
<u>Teachers</u>										
School A (n=38)	24	14	-	18	11	6	1	10	25	3
School B (n=25)	18	7	-	8	12	3	2	2	22	1
School C (n=19)	15	4	-	9	6	-	2	1	18	-
TOTAL (n=82)	57	25		35	29	9	5	13	65	4
<u>Students</u>										
School A (n=16)	9	7	16	-	-	-	-	16	-	-
School B (n=14)	7	7	14	-	-	-	-	14	-	-
School C (n=47)	18	29	47	-	-	-	-	47	-	-
TOTAL (n=77)	34	43	77					77		

Table 2

Description of Sample by Work Hours and Formal Education
(N=168)

Group	Work Hours Per Week						Years of Formal Education			
	20-26	27-33	34-40	41-47	48-54	55-61	10-12	13-15	16-18	19-21
<u>Administrators</u>										
School A (n=2)	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-
School B (n=4)	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	2
School C (n=3)	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	2	1
TOTAL (n=9)			2	1	4	2			6	3
<u>Teachers</u>										
School A (n=38)	-	3	7	12	11	3	-	1	32	5
School B (n=25)	-	-	6	10	5	-	-	1	15	9
School C (n=19)	-	-	2	11	5	-	-	1	16	2
TOTAL (n=82)		3	15	33	21	3		3	63	16
<u>Students</u>										
School A (n=16)	1	3	3	4	3	1	16	-	-	-
School B (n=14)	-	1	4	3	1	-	13	1	-	-
School C (n=47)	14	10	9	5	2	3	45	2	-	-
TOTAL (n=77)	15	14	16	12	6	4	74	3		

participating teachers within their schools. The Students' Union coordinators offered to distribute and collect the questionnaires from the student council members.

In School A, questionnaires were distributed to the four administrators, all twenty-five student council members and a random sample of one-half of the 76 teachers in the school. There was a 50% return from the administrators, 100% return from the teachers and a 64% return from the Student Council members.

In School B, questionnaires were distributed to the five administrators, all twenty-five student council members and a random sample of one-half of the 66 teachers in the school. There was an 80% return from the administrators, 76% return from the teachers and a 56% return from the Student Council members.

In School C, questionnaires were distributed to the four administrators, all 47 student council members and a random sample of one-half of the 68 teachers. There was a 75% return from the administrators, 56% return from the teachers and a 100% return from the Student Council members.

From the total population, there was a 70% return from the 13 administrators, a 78% return from the 105 possible teachers and an 80% return from the 97 possible Stu-

dent Council members.

Anonymity was maintained for each group member. Each member was identified by school and group only. Each group had a different color coded questionnaire; yellow - administrators, green - teachers, and blue - students.

Two computer data cards were prepared for each respondent. These cards contained the personal information data, the Satisfaction Subscale data and the data from each of the three decision-making subscales for each respondent. There were 336 data cards required for the total sample of 168.

DATA ANALYSIS

Decision-Making Orientations of the Total Sample

Initially, identical groups from each school were combined into three larger composite groups of 9 administrators, 82 teachers and 77 student council members. By maintaining an approximately equal number of teachers and students in the total sample (82 teachers and 77 students), it was possible to determine the predominant decision-making groups on the Perceived and Preferred Subscales by the aforementioned technique without giving undue bias or percentage weighting to any one of the groups. Percentage weightings could have been given to the small administrative

group to make its influence proportionate to the other two groups but insignificant differences were found between the teachers and administrators, thereby negating the necessity of such a step.

Inter-Group Comparison of the Three Groups on the Decision-Making and Satisfaction Subscales.

After inspecting some of the inferred decision-making groups suggested by the respondents, as a collective unit, it was necessary to become more definitive and look within the total sample, comparing the three groups on all three decision-making subscales for possible areas of conflict and consensus about the appropriate decision-making groups. Significant differences were noted between the groups on some items after graphing the chosen decision-making distribution patterns for each group. These group differences were further substantiated by using the Chi-square test for significant differences (Siegel, 1956:175) on the two nominal subscales (Perceived and Preferred) and the Scheffé test on the Intended and Satisfaction Subscales.

The ordinal nature of the Intended Subscale made it possible to compare the means of each group, on the thirty decision items, using the Scheffé multiple comparison test (Ferguson, 1966:296). This parametric test identified significant differences between different groups on the Intended

Subscale. A group mean was calculated for each group by averaging the mean of the thirty decision items. If the mean score of a group on a particular decision item was higher than the group mean, then that group was considered highly committed to that decision item. If another group, on the same decision item had a mean score lower than their group mean then that group was considered lowly committed to the item. For example, if the teachers were highly committed to a particular decision item, the students lowly committed and the administrators lowly committed, then this particular decision item would be teacher-oriented on the Intended Decision-Making Subscale. Decision items to which all three groups were highly committed were considered shared decisions. If two groups were highly committed to a decision item then it was considered a partially shared decision. Items to which no group was highly committed were considered non-threatening items of low priority and preferably resolved as indicated in the Preferred Subscale.

Inter-School Comparison of Similar Groups on the Decision-Making and Satisfaction Subscales

Decision-making orientations of each school were determined using twice as many staff as students. Consequently, a heavier weighting was given to the decision-making orientations of the professional member groups (administrators and

teachers) in the school. This weighted sample was used to determine possible decision-making differences that could be attributed to the professional member groups rather than the equal group representation (1 staff: 1 student) that was used in the first section. The modes of analysis and statistics used in the previous two sections were used on the inter-school comparison.

Intra-School Comparison of Different Member Groups within a School.

To identify conflict items within each school, which were not identified in the inter-school analysis, an intra-school analysis was required. Different member groups, within each school, were compared on the decision-making and satisfaction subscales using similar techniques of analysis that were used in the first section.

SUMMARY

In this Chapter, a description of the instrument was provided. The sample and method of data collection were described. The four phases of data analysis were presented.

The instrument contains five sections; the personal information section with five questions, the Satisfaction Subscale with six items and the three decision-making subscales with the same thirty items in each subscale.

The study was conducted in three urban high schools and involved a total of 168 usable replies from administrators, teachers and student council members. All responses were coded on computer data cards.

To determine significant differences in the data analysis, the Scheffé multiple comparison test was used on the ordinal subscales because it accommodated unequal numbers of members in different groups (Ferguson, 1966: 297). On the nominal subscales, where the expected distribution patterns were unknown, the Chi-square (x^2) test was used to locate significant group differences (Siegel, 1956:193). Only those differences at a level of probability less than .05 were recorded in the study.

CHAPTER 4

DECISION-MAKING ORIENTATIONS OF ADMINISTRATORS, TEACHERS, AND STUDENTS

The findings of this chapter are related to the first four subproblems.

(1) What decision-making sources do students, teachers and administrators collectively perceive and prefer on school decision items?

(2) What differences exist between the decision-making orientations of the three groups, on the Perceived, Preferred and Intended Decision-Making Subscales?

(3) What decision-making conflicts can be observed from the perceived, preferred and intended decision-making orientations of administrators, teachers and students?

(4) What relationship exists between the different decision-making orientations of the three groups and their satisfaction levels?

PERCEIVED DECISION-MAKING ORIENTATIONS

This section is concerned with the decision-making orientations that staff and students collectively perceived. The decision-making orientations perceived collectively by the staff (administrators and teachers) and students were

divided into four categories: (1) Administrator-Oriented Decisions (all A, A-T, A-S and A-T-S responses, (2) Teacher-Oriented Decisions (A-T, A-T-S, T-S and T responses), (3) Student-Oriented Decisions (A-S, A-T-S, T-S and S responses) and (4) Shared Decisions (A-T-S).

Some of the decision items on the Perceived Subscale were not, presently, applicable (9, 23, 24 and 29). Other items were not applicable at some schools (Item 21) and caused a slight reduction in the total possible number of decision-making responses.

Perceived Administrator-Oriented Decisions

Administrator-oriented decisions are those decisions that the majority of respondents (staff and students) collectively accredited to all possible decision-making combinations involving the administrator (A, A-T, A-S and A-T-S). The percentage frequencies of each decision-making combination involving the administrator are presented in Table 3 for all perceived administrator-oriented decisions. Fifty-three percent of the decision items were perceived as administrator-oriented. Some items which were more strongly perceived as administrator-oriented than the other items, were: 2-Class size, 3-Dismissal of a teacher, 17-Student timetables, 22-Selection of a staff and 30-Student-choice of a teacher. Table 3 seems to substantiate the findings of Simpkins (1968) and Clarke (1970) that most

Table 3

Percentage Frequencies of the Total Sample on
the Perceived Subscale with regard
to Administrator-Oriented
Decisions
(N=168)

Perceived Administrator-Oriented Decisions	% of Decision-Making Group				% of Total Sample
	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	
2. Class size	52.4	39.9	0.6	3.0	95.9
8. Evaluation of teachers	32.7	25.0	7.1	5.4	70.2
10. Attendance policy	17.9	56.0	1.2	10.7	85.8
12. Student suspension	35.3	44.3	1.2	15.6	96.4
13. Dismissal of a teacher	41.1	17.9	6.0	4.2	69.2
14. Parental contact concerning student	16.1	64.9	0.0	10.7	91.7
17. Student time-tables	43.5	16.7	19.0	15.5	94.7
19. Organization of staff meetings	35.1	45.8	1.8	7.7	90.4
20. Subjects allotted to a teacher	16.7	60.7	1.2	0.6	89.2
21. Allocation of student awards	7.7	33.3	0.6	35.1	76.6
22. Selection of staff	60.1	18.5	0.6	1.2	80.4
25. School drug policy	33.3	20.8	0.6	19.0	73.7

Table 3 (continued)

Perceived Administrator-Oriented Decisions	% of Decision-Making Group				% of Total Sample
	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	
26. Parental influence in the school	17.9	22.6	1.2	27.4	69.1
27. Evaluation of Stu- dent Union Advisor	18.5	6.0	11.3	19.6	55.4
28. Expenditure of School Board funds	37.5	35.1	1.8	7.1	81.5
30. Student-choice of a teacher	43.5	10.1	8.3	10.1	72.0

matters external to the classroom situation are perceived as administrator-oriented decisions.

Perceived Teacher-Oriented Decisions

Teacher-oriented decisions are those decisions that the majority of respondents accredited to all possible decision-making combinations involving the teacher (A-T, A-T-S, T-S and T). All the curriculum and classroom management items, listed in Table 4, were considered teacher-

Table 4

Percentage Frequencies of the Total Sample
on the Perceived Subscale with regard
to Teacher-Oriented Decisions
(N=168)

Perceived Teacher-Oriented Decisions	% of Decision-Making Group				% of Total Sample
	A-T	A-T-S	T-S	T	
1. Extent of know- ledge to be taught	36.3	9.5	10.7	22.6	79.1
3. Homework fre- quency	3.6	1.2	28.0	60.1	92.9
5. Selection of supervisors for student activities	24.4	32.1	20.2	7.7	84.4
7. Evaluation of students	32.1	4.2	12.5	45.2	94.0
11. Late policy	39.3	6.5	7.1	26.2	79.1
15. Classroom standards	17.9	8.9	27.4	38.1	92.3

oriented decisions. Such items as: 1 - Extent of knowledge to be taught, 3 - Homework frequency, 7 - Evaluation of students, 11 - Late-policy and 15 - Classroom standards seem to be perceived as decisions within the classroom, under the direction of the teacher.

These findings support the research of Simpkins and Clarke, with the exception of Item 5 - Selection of supervisors for student activities. This decision item was perceived as teacher-oriented, with all three groups giving priority to the shared (A-T-S) and partially shared (A-T and T-S) decision-making groups. Twenty percent of the thirty decision items were perceived as teacher-oriented.

Perceived Student-Oriented Decisions

Student-oriented decisions are those decisions that the majority of respondents accredited to all possible decision-making combinations involving the student (A-S, A-T-S, T-S and S). Only two items, 16 - Student dress regulations and 18 - Expenditure of Student Union funds, were perceived as student-oriented. Table 5 indicates that item 18 was more strongly perceived as student-oriented than item 16. The two student-oriented decision items outlined in Table 5 represent seven percent of the thirty decision items.

Table 5

Percentage Frequencies of the Total Sample on the Perceived Subscale with regard to Student-Oriented Decisions
(N=168)

Perceived Student-Oriented Decisions	% of Chosen Decision- Making Group				% of Total Sample
	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	S	
16. Student dress regulations	1.2	27.4	7.1	22.6	58.3
18. Expenditure of Student Union funds	17.9	29.8	11.9	26.2	85.3

Perceived Shared Decisions

Shared decisions are those decisions where over fifty percent of the respondents accredited the decision to all three groups (A-T-S). Seven percent of the decision items, two items, were perceived as shared (Table 6.)

These two items were quite strongly perceived as shared decisions by most groups. Item 4 - Extra curricular program was perceived as shared by 44% of the administrators, 49% of the teachers and 55% of the students. Item 6 - Student body regulations was perceived as shared by 78% of the administrators, 61% of the teachers and 36% of the students (Table 38 - Appendix B). This study found that

Table 6

Percentage Frequencies of the Total Sample on the Perceived
Subscale with regard to Shared Decisions
(N=168)

Perceived Shared Decisions	% of Chosen Decision- Making Group	% of Total Sample
A-T-S		
4. Extra-curricular program	51.2	51.2
6. Student body regulations	50.6	50.6

only 12% of the teachers felt the A-T group was influential in extra-curricular activities. Findings from this study indicated that the majority of two groups (78% of the administrators and 61% of the teachers) perceived this decision item to be shared (A-T-S).

The findings on the Perceived Decision-Making Subscale seem to indicate that when students are introduced as possible members of the decision-making process, involving teachers and administrators, some decision items shift from the higher decision-making authorities to the lower or shared decision-making groups. This seemed to apply to five decision items particularly: 4 - Extra-curricular program, 5 - Selection of supervisors for stu-

dent activities, 6 - Student body regulations, 16 - Student dress regulations and 18 - Expenditure of Student Union funds.

PREFERRED DECISION-MAKING ORIENTATIONS

All thirty decision items were applicable to the preferred decision-making section. Therefore, the N/A response category that was used on the Perceived Subscale was deleted from the Preferred Subscale. This reduced the number of response categories on the Preferred Subscale from eight to seven: A, A-T, A-S, A-T-S, T-S, T and S.

This section is concerned with the preferred decision-making orientations of both staff (administrators and teachers) and students. The decision-making orientations preferred by the collective group sample were divided into the same four categories as the previous section.

Preferred Administrator-Oriented Decisions

If the majority of respondents preferred the A, A-T, A-S and A-T-S decision-making responses for an item, then that item was considered administrator-oriented on the Preferred Subscale. There was a 50% reduction in the total number of administrator-oriented decisions from the Perceived to the Preferred Subscale, reducing the number of

decision items from sixteen to eight. This shift could be attributed to (1) the larger number of students and teachers in the sample desiring a greater voice in the decision-making of their school, (2) the desire of staff to relinquish their unilateral decision-making (A) for either shared (A-T-S) or partially shared forms of decision-making (A-T, A-S or T-S).

The eight remaining administrator-oriented items listed in Table 7, seemed to be desired by the three groups with varying degrees of preference. The three groups preferred those decisions exhibiting a high degree of finality to be quite strongly administrator-oriented. Such items as: 13 - Dismissal of a teacher, 17 - Student timetables, 22 - Selection of staff, 29 - Selection of a principal and 30 - Student-choice of a teacher, seemed to require the expert guidance and judgment of the administrator. An average of 68% of the teachers preferred to become involved in administrator-oriented decisions on a shared (A-T-S) or partially shared basis (A-T). However, three exceptions were decision items 8 - Evaluation of teachers, 19 - Organization of staff meetings and 28 - Expenditure of School Board funds. On these three items 75%, 85%, and 95% of the teachers, respectively, preferred to become involved in an A-T or A-T-S decision-making group (Table 39 - Appendix B).

Table 7

Percentage Frequencies of the Total Sample on the Preferred Subscale with regard to Administrator-Oriented Decisions (N=168)

Preferred Administrator-Oriented Decisions	% of Decision-Making Group				% of Total Sample
	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	
8. Evaluation of teachers	4.8	19.6	16.1	32.7	73.2
13. Dismissal of a teacher	16.7	44.0	10.7	25.0	96.4
17. Student time-tables	14.3	13.7	20.8	38.7	87.5
19. Organization of staff meetings	4.8	78.0	0.6	13.7	97.1
22. Selection of staff	33.3	36.3	11.3	18.5	99.4
28. Expenditure of School Board funds	7.1	51.2	3.6	36.3	98.2
29. Selection of a principal	29.8	33.3	1.8	19.0	83.9
30. Student-choice of a teacher	12.5	19.0	13.1	26.2	70.8

An average of only 50% of the students preferred to become involved in administrator-oriented decisions on a shared (A-T-S) or partially shared (A-S) basis. There

were three exceptions; 8 - Evaluation of teachers, 28 - Expenditure of School Board funds and 30 - Student-choice of a teacher, where an average of 80% of the students preferred to become involved.

Preferred Teacher-Oriented Decisions

If the majority of respondents preferred the A-T, A-T-S, T-S and T decision-making responses for an item, then that item was considered teacher-oriented on the Preferred Subscale. There was a 100% increase in the number of teacher-oriented decisions, increasing the perceived six items to twelve on the Preferred Subscale. Only one of the six originally perceived teacher-oriented decision items, 5 - Selection of student supervisors, shifted to a lower level (student-oriented) on the Preferred Subscale. This change was investigated by interviewing some of the principals involved in the study. They felt the selection of student supervisors was becoming a student-oriented decision, because of the many additional extra-curricular activities, requiring students to solicit staff support.

In addition to the five perceived classroom decisions (1, 3, 7, 11 and 15), seven new teacher-oriented decisions were preferred by the respondents. Two of the added decision items, 9 - Evaluation of administrators and 24 - Staff cabinet, were not applicable on the Perceived

Subscale and the other five items (2, 10, 12, 14 and 20) shifted from the perceived administrator-oriented subscale to the preferred teacher-oriented subscale. All twelve preferred teacher-oriented decisions are listed in Table 8. The table indicates that either shared (A-T-S) or partially shared (A-T or T-S) response categories were the favored decision-making groups for all twelve items.

On decision items, within the classroom; 1 - Extent of knowledge to be taught, 3 - Homework frequency, 7 - Evaluation of students, 11 - Late policy and 15 - Classroom standards, 91% of the teachers preferred the items to remain teacher-oriented (A-T, A-T-S, T-S and T), 75% of the administrators desired involvement in the A-T and A-T-S decision-making groups and 60% of the students preferred involvement in either the T-S or A-T-S groups. Homework frequency was the one classroom item in which administrators did not desire any involvement.

All three groups desired involvement in the seven decision items externally related to the classroom: 2 - Class size, 9 - Evaluation of administrators, 10 - Attendance policy, 12 - Student suspension, 14 - Parental contact concerning student, 20 - Subjects allotted to a teacher and 24 - Staff cabinet. An average of 85% of the teachers desired involvement in these decisions on an A-T or A-T-S

Table 8

Percentage Frequencies of the Total Sample on the Preferred Subscale with regard to Teacher-Oriented Decisions (N=168)

Preferred Teacher-Oriented Decisions	% of Decision-Making Group				% of Total Sample
	A-T	A-T-S	T-S	T	
1. Extent of knowledge to be taught	23.8	32.1	25.0	13.1	94.0
2. Class size	47.6	17.9	13.7	16.1	95.3
3. Homework frequency	2.4	10.1	45.2	36.9	94.6
7. Evaluation of students	14.3	15.5	42.9	25.0	97.7
9. Evaluation of administrators	18.5	35.1	28.0	8.9	90.5
10. Attendance policy	23.8	39.9	20.8	6.5	91.0
11. Late policy	22.0	33.9	22.0	11.3	89.2
12. Student suspension	32.1	44.6	10.7	1.2	88.6
14. Parental contact concerning student	39.3	31.0	10.7	6.0	87.0
15. Classroom standards	11.3	24.4	37.5	22.0	95.2
20. Subjects allotted to a teacher	57.7	13.1	3.0	17.9	91.7
24. Staff cabinet	63.7	13.1	1.2	14.9	92.9

basis, 92% of the administrators preferred involvement on the same basis and 60% of the students preferred involvement in these items on an A-T-S or T-S basis, with the exception of Item 24 - Staff cabinet, for which the students showed a rather negligible concern (Table 38 - Appendix B).

The findings from these last two subsections seem to indicate that teachers have a high preference for involvement in all teacher-oriented decisions and three administrator-oriented decisions (8, 19 and 28). The findings of Simpkins (1968:198) and Clarke (1970) seem to substantiate this position. They found that the formal staff group preferred to become more involved in decisions that were external to the classroom. Administrators preferred a high involvement in all administrator-oriented decisions and teacher-oriented decisions, with the exception of Item 3 - Homework frequency. Students showed only a moderate desire for involvement in both teacher and administrator-oriented decisions, with the exception of Items 8, 9, 28 and 30, where the preferred degree of involvement was quite high.

Preferred Student-Oriented Decisions

If the majority of respondents preferred the A-S, A-T-S, T-S and S decision-making groups for an item, then that item was considered student-oriented on the Preferred

Subscale. The two items (16 and 18) which were perceived as student-oriented were preferred by the staff and students to remain student-oriented. Three other decision items, 5 - Selection of supervisors for students, 23 - Student cabinet and 27 - Evaluation of Student Union Advisor, were added to the preferred student-oriented decisions. This brought the total number of preferred student-oriented decisions listed in Table 9 to five, seventeen percent of the total number of items.

Table 9

Percentage Frequencies of the Total Sample on the Preferred Subscale with regard to Student-Oriented Decisions
(N=168)

Preferred Student-Oriented Decisions	% of Chosen Decision- Making-Group				% of Total Sample
	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	S	
5. Selection of supervisors for students	2.3	44.0	20.2	19.6	86.1
16. Student dress regulations	1.8	38.7	8.9	41.1	90.5
18. Expenditure of Student Union funds	17.9	37.5	10.1	31.0	96.5
23. Student cab- inet	21.4	42.3	8.3	22.0	94.0
27. Evaluation of Student Union Ad- visor	14.9	46.4	4.2	26.8	92.3

On the student-oriented decisions, 83% of the students preferred to become involved in the A-S, A-T-S, T-S and S decision-making groups and 60% of the teachers and administrators showed moderate interest in the shared (A-T-S) or partially-shared (A-S or T-S) decision-making groups. However, both administrators and teachers showed a high interest in Item 5 - Selection of Student supervisors, indicating approximately 80% of the teachers and administrators preferred to become involved in this item (Table 38 - Appendix B).

Preferred Shared Decisions

If over fifty percent of the staff and students collectively preferred the A-T-S decision-making group for an item, then that item was considered a preferred shared decision. A total of five items were preferred to be shared. These five preferred items, listed in Table 10, included the two perceived shared decisions (4 and 6) besides three additional items (21, 25 and 26) attained from the perceived administrator-oriented items.

There was a high to moderate preference for these five items (4, 6, 21, 25 and 26) being shared by the three groups. 87% of the administrators preferred the shared decision-making groups, 62% of the teachers showed the same preference and 56% of the students made the same choice

(Table 39 - Appendix B).

Table 10

Percentage Frequencies of the Total Sample on the Preferred
Subscale with regard to Shared Decisions
(N=168)

Preferred Shared Decisions	% of Chosen Decision- Making Group	% of Total Sample
A-T-S		
4. Extra-curricular program	53.0	53.0
6. Student body regulations	61.9	61.9
21. Allocation of Student awards	59.5	59.5
25. School drug policy	69.6	69.6
26. Parental influence in the school	66.1	66.1

DIFFERENT DECISION-MAKING ORIENTATIONS OF ADMINISTRATORS, TEACHERS, AND STUDENTS

This section is concerned with specific decision items that have significantly different perceived, preferred and intended decision-making orientations among the three groups. Some of these differences have already been cited in the previous two sections. To clarify and identify these differences the decision-making responses (A, A-T, A-S,

A-T-S, T-S T or S) of each group have been collapsed into the four aforementioned decision-making orientations (Administrator, Teacher, Student or Shared Oriented) and tested for significant differences on the Perceived and Preferred Subscales using the Chi-Square (χ^2) test. If the actual decision-making choices of any particular group are required, reference should be made to Table 38 - Appendix B. Significant differences in each groups' commitment to various decision items were identified using the Scheffé multiple comparison of group means on the Intended Subscale.

Differences in the Perceived Decision-Making Orientations of the Three Groups

Perceived differences in decision-making may or may not be responsible for emerging conflicts between different groups. If a group perceives of themselves as being responsible for a certain decision items and prefer it that way, then such a difference may not be considered a conflict. However, if a group is aware that they are not responsible for a particular decision and prefer to be responsible, then such a difference may lead to conflict. Consequently, perceived decision-making orientations, when considered without the preferred and intended decision-making orientations of a group do not necessarily indicate conflict decision items.

There were only two decision items, 6 - Student body

regulations and 27 - Evaluation of Students' Union Advisor, upon which the students perceived a significantly different decision-making orientation from the other two groups (Table 11).

Table 11

Decision Items, Exhibiting a Significant Difference between the Perceived Decision-Making Orientations of Administrators, Teachers and Students

Decision Items	Group	% of Chosen Decision-Making Orientation			
		Admin. Orient.	Teacher Orient.	Student Orient.	Shared Orient.
6. Student body regulations	Admin.				78
	Teachers				61
	Students	94			
27. Evaluation of Student-Union Advisor	Admin.	78			
	Teachers	46			
	Students				66

Only significant differences at $p < .05$ are reported.

The students perceived Student body regulations to be administrator-oriented, while the staff perceived it as a shared decision item and Item 27 - Evaluation of the Student Union Advisor was perceived administrator-oriented by the staff but student-oriented by the students. All other decision items were perceived by the three groups as outlined in the first section of this Chapter.

Differences in the Preferred Decision-Making Orientations of the Three Groups

Several potential conflict decision items have already been stated in the preferred decision-making orientations of the collective sample of staff and students. However, there are decision items that could not be foreseen as conflict items, unless the three groups were compared separately, on their preferred decision-making orientations. These are decision items where the cohesive consensus of a group may be latent or felt (Pondy, 1967:300) as diametrically opposite to the decision-making orientations of another group. There were fourteen decision items (Table 12) where the three groups seemed to be either partially opposed (one group disagreed with the other two) or totally opposed (all three groups disagreed) to the preferred decision-making orientations of the other groups.

Five decision items upon which the three groups preferred totally different decision-making orientations were Item 8 - Evaluation of teachers, Item 9 - Evaluation of administrators, Item 10 - Attendance policy, Item 11 - Late policy and Item 30 - Student-choice of a teacher. On the other nine decision items (4, 5, 6, 12, 16, 17, 23, 27 and 28) one group seemed to prefer a different decision-making orientation to the other two groups. The staff (administrators and teachers) preferred Item 4 - Extra-curricular pro-

Table 12

Decision Items, Exhibiting a Significant Difference
between the Preferred Decision-Making Orientations
of Administrators, Teachers and Students

Decision Items	Group	% of Chosen Decision-Making Orientation			
		Admin. Orient.	Teacher Orient.	Student Orient.	Shared Orient.
4. Extra-curricular program	Admin.				67
	Teachers				66
	Students			98	
5. Selection of student- supervisors	Admin.				78
	Teachers				55
	Students			92	
6. Student body regulations	Admin.				89
	Teachers				74
	Students			98	
8. Evaluation of teachers	Admin.				56
	Teachers		93		
	Students			87	
9. Evaluation of administrators	Admin.				67
	Teachers		94		
	Students			92	
10. Attendance policy	Admin.				89
	Teachers		98		
	Students			93	

Table 12 (continued)

Decision Items	Group	% of Chosen Decision-Making Orientation			
		Admin. Orient.	Teacher Orient.	Student Orient.	Shared Orient.
11. Late policy	Admin.				78
	Teachers		97		
	Students			83	
12. Student suspension	Admin.				67
	Teachers	96			
	Students				53
16. Student dress regulations	Admin.				56
	Teachers				54
	Students			95	
17. Student timetables	Admin.	100			
	Teachers	98			
	Students			86	
23. Student cabinet	Admin.				78
	Teachers			94	
	Students			93	
27. Evaluation of Student Union Advisor	Admin.				67
	Teachers				57
	Students			93	

Table 12 (continued)

Decision Items	Group	% of Chosen Decision-Making Orientation			
		Admin. Orient.	Teacher Orient.	Student Orient.	Shared Orient.
28. Expenditure of School Board funds	Admin.	100			
	Teachers	99			
	Students				58
30. Student-choice of a teacher	Admin.				67
	Teachers	81			
	Students			79	

Only differences significant at $p < .05$ are reported.

gram, Item 5 - Selection of student supervisors, Item 6 - Student body regulations, Item 16 - Student dress regulations and Item 27 - Evaluation of Student Union Advisor to be shared decisions, while the students preferred these five items to be student-oriented. Two items, Item 17 - Student timetables and Item 28 - Expenditure of School Board funds, were preferred by the staff to be administrator-oriented, while the students preferred Item 17 to be student-oriented and Item 28 shared. Item 12 - Student suspension, was preferred shared by the administrators and students and preferred administrator-oriented by the teachers. Item 23 - Student cabinet was preferred student-oriented by the students and teachers and preferably shared by the administrators. To determine if any of the above fourteen decision items are either felt or latent conflicts, it becomes necessary to study the perceived and preferred decision-making orientations of the total sample in conjunction with the internal differences exhibited by the preferences of each group.

A difference between each groups decision-making orientations within the preferred and perceived decision-making subscales or a difference between the perceived and preferred decision-making subscales by one group or all groups can often be indicative of potential conflict items.

If there are numerous differences expressed within and between the decision-making subscales, then the greater the probability of possible conflict. Those decision items which appear to have the greatest number of different decision-making orientations both within and between the decision-making subscales are; Item 6 - Student body regulations, Item 8 - Evaluation of teachers, Item 9 - Evaluation of administrators, Item 10 - Attendance policy, Item 11 - Late policy, Item 17 - Student timetables, Item 28 - Expenditure of School Board funds and Item 30 - Student-choice of a teacher. These eight decision items seem to have the greatest latent or felt conflict potential with respect to the Perceived and Preferred Decision-Making Subscales.

To determine the authenticity and possible omissions of the above conflict items requires a thorough examination of the commitment or intended decision-making time each group is willing to allot to any particular decision item.

Differences in the Intended Decision-Making Orientations of the Three Groups

The Intended Decision-Making Subscale was designed to determine how much additional time and energy each group would be willing to commit to the thirty decision

items, beyond their present work commitments. The responses of this subscale were of an ordinal nature, ranging from 0 hours/week to 2.5 hours/week by half-hour increments, giving a total of six possible response categories. A reply of 0 hours/week on a decision item indicates that the respondent is willing to commit a negligible amount of time to the decision-making processes concerning that item. The average number of additional hours per week each group was willing to commit to each decision item and the percentage frequencies of those group members willing to commit more than zero hours per week to an item were tabulated and summarized in Table 12. The Scheffé multiple comparison test was used to compare the different group means on each item and identify significant differences between the groups having a probability level less than .05. The results implied in Table 13 would seem to indicate that the students are willing to commit a significantly higher amount of decision-making time to all items, with the exception of items 2, 14, 19 and 26, than either the administrators or teachers.

To determine the item priorities of each group and the degree of commitment on the Intended Subscale, the items were ranked in accordance with the additional amount of time a group was willing to commit to each item, as shown

Table 13

Comparison of the Means and Percentage Frequencies of Administrators, Teachers and Students on the Intended Decision-Making Subscale
(N=168)

Decision Items	Group	Intended Decision-Making Subscale	
		Mean Hrs/Wk	% of each group willing to commit more time to item
1. Extent of knowledge to be taught	A	.55	66
	T	.60	60
	S*	1.05*	78
2. Class size	A	.20	33
	T	.40	58
	S	.50	61
3. Homework frequency	A	.10	22
	T	.20	24
	S*	.60*	70
4. Extra-curricular program	A	.20	44
	T	.50	49
	S*	1.25*	82
5. Selection of supervisors for student activities	A	.20	22
	T	.20	29
	S*	.90*	75
6. Student body regulations	A	.35	33
	T	.35	46
	S*	1.15*	82
7. Evaluation of students	A	.40	33
	T	.65	61
	S*	1.00*	77
8. Evaluation of teachers	A	.55	33
	T	.45	55
	S*	1.05*	79

Table 13 (continued)

Decision Items	Group	Intended Decision-Making Subscale	
		Mean Hrs/Wk	% of each group willing to commit more time to item
9. Evaluation of administrators	A	.50	33
	T	.40	52
	S*	1.00*	74
10. Attendance policy	A	.20	33
	T	.30	45
	S*	.80*	67
11. Late policy	A	.15	22
	T	.20	30
	S*	.60*	61
12. Student suspension	A	.15	22
	T	.30	48
	S*	.80*	67
13. Dismissal of a teacher	A	.45	33
	T	.30	40
	S*	.80*	61
14. Parental contact concerning student	A	.40	22
	T	.45	60
	S	.65	65
15. Classroom standards	A	.35	33
	T	.30	34
	S*	.70*	69
16. Student dress regulations	A	.15	22
	T	.15	24
	S*	.60*	53
17. Student timetables	A	.50	33
	T	.35	41
	S*	.95*	74
18. Expenditure of Student Union funds	A	.15	22
	T	.25	34
	S*	.95*	66

Table 13 (continued)

Decision Items	Group	Intended Decision-Making Subscale	
		Mean Hrs/Wk	% of each group willing to commit more time to item
19.Organization of staff meetings	A	.15	22
	T	.25	43
	S	.35	46
20.Subjects allotted to a teacher	A	.35	33
	T	.40	56
	S*	.75*	64
21.Allocation of student awards	A	.20	44
	T	.25	40
	S*	.80*	69
22.Selection of a staff	A	.60	44
	T	.35	45
	S*	1.00*	65
23.Student cabinet	A	.30	54
	T	.20	33
	S*	.95*	69
24.Staff cabinet	A	.20	44
	T	.30	46
	S*	.60*	49
25.School drug	A	.60	56
	T	.40	55
	S*	1.05 *	70
26.Parental influence in the school	A	.60	33
	T	.35	52
	S	.60	57
27.Evaluation of Student Union advisor	A	.20	33
	T	.15	22
	S*	.70*	64
28.Expenditure of School Board funds	A	.40	33
	T	.55	66
	S*	.95*	67

Table 13 (continued)

Decision Items	Group	Intended Decision-Making Subscale	
		Mean Hrs/Wk	% of each group willing to commit more time to item
29. Selection of a principal	A	.55	33
	T	.25	33
	S*	.85*	64
30. Student-choice of a teacher	A	.40	33
	T	.30	41
	S*	1.10*	76

*Group differs significantly ($p < .05$) with other groups

in Table 14. Then, a group mean was calculated for all the decision items, indicating the average amount of time a group was willing to commit to any decision item. The group mean of the administrators and teachers was 0.34 hours/week, while that of the students was 0.84 hours/week. This high student group-mean seems to substantiate the significantly higher student commitment to all decision items found earlier in Table 13.

Each groups priority for an item on the Intended Decision-Making Subscale was attained by comparing each group's committed mean hours per week for an item to that same group's total mean. If the group's committed mean hours per week on a particular item was higher than the group's total mean, then the commitment to that item was ranked high for that particular group. These high and low rankings of the three groups yielded eight possible decision-making arrangements on the Intended Decision-Making Subscale:

<u>Administrator Rank</u>	<u>Teacher Rank</u>	<u>Student Rank</u>	<u>Intended D-M Group</u>
high	low	low	A
high	high	low	A-T
high	low	high	A-S
high	high	high	A-T-S
low	high	high	T-S
low	high	low	T
low	low	high	S
low	low	low	No Commitment

Table 14

Administrator, Teacher and Student Rankings in
 Accordance with Their Mean Scores attained
 on the Intended Decision-Making
 Subscale
 (N=168)

Administrators (n=9)			Teachers (n=82)			Students (n=77)		
Mean Hrs	Item		Mean Hrs	Item		Mean Hrs	Item	
Per week	No.	Rank	Per week	No.	Rank	Per week	No.	Rank
0.60	22	2	0.65	7	1	1.25	4	1
0.60	25	2	0.60	1	2	1.15	6	2
0.60	26	2	0.55	28	3	1.10	30	3
0.55	1	5	0.50	4	4	1.05	1	5
0.55	8	5	0.45	8	5.5	1.05	8	5
0.55	29	5	0.45	14	5.5	1.05	25	5
0.50	9	7.5	0.40	2	8.5	1.00	7	8
0.50	17	7.5	0.40	9	8.5	1.00	9	8
0.45	13	9	0.40	20	8.5	1.00	22	8
0.40	7	11.5	0.40	25	8.5	0.95	17	11.5
0.40	14	11.5	0.35	22	12.5	0.95	18	11.5
0.40	28	11.5	0.35	6	12.5	0.95	23	11.5
0.40	30	11.5	0.35	17	12.5	0.95	28	11.5
0.35	6	15	0.35	26	12.5	0.90	5	14
0.35	15	15	0.30	10	17.5	0.85	29	15
0.35	20	15	0.30	12	17.5	0.80	10	17.5
0.10	3	30	0.30	13	17.5	0.35	19	30
0.30	23	17	0.30	15	17.5	0.80	12	17.5
0.20	2	21	0.30	24	17.5	0.80	13	17.5
0.20	4	21	0.30	30	17.5	0.80	21	17.5
0.20	5	21	0.25	18	22.5	0.75	20	20
0.20	10	21	0.25	19	22.5	0.70	15	21.5
0.20	21	21	0.25	21	22.5	0.70	27	21.5
0.20	24	21	0.25	29	22.5	0.65	14	23
0.20	27	21	0.20	3	26.5	0.60	3	26
0.15	11	27	0.20	5	26.5	0.60	11	26
0.15	12	27	0.20	11	26.5	0.60	16	26
0.15	16	27	0.20	23	26.5	0.60	24	26
0.15	18	27	0.15	16	29.5	0.60	26	26
0.15	19	27	0.15	27	29.5	0.50	2	29
0.34 Mean of Total			0.34 Mean of Total			0.84 Mean of Total		

The last decision-making group, where all the groups had a low commitment to the item, would seem to indicate that the decision item was not threatening to any group and required No Commitment (N.C.) by any of the three groups. A summary of the intended decision-making groups for each item is given in Table 15.

The rankings of each group (Table 15) indicate that all three groups were willing to commit considerable time to nine items (1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 17, 22, 25 and 28) and minimal additional time to another nine decision items (3, 10, 11, 12, 16, 19, 21, 24 and 27). Administrators were the only group that had a high time commitment rank to Items 13 - Dismissal of a teacher and 15 - Classroom standards. Only teachers showed a highly ranked interest in Item 2 - Class size, while students were the sole group ranking Items 5, 18 and 23 highly on the Intended Decision-Making Subscale. Various pairs of the three groups (A-T, A-S, or T-S) indicated high commitment on the remaining six decision items (4, 14, 20, 26, 29 and 30).

These high commitments of various groups seem to substantiate some of the latent and felt conflicts found earlier on the perceived and preferred decision-making subscales, as well as, identify some unforeseen conflict areas, not identified on the first two decision-making subscales.

Table 15

Intended Decision-Making Groups for Decision Items Ranked by
the Three Groups on the Intended Decision-Making Sub-
scale

Decision Items	Admin. Rank	Teacher Rank	Student Rank	Intended Decision- Making Group
1. Extent of knowledge to be taught	high	high	high	A-T-S
2. Class size	low	high	low	T
3. Homework fre- quency	low	low	low	N.C.
4. Extra-curricular program	low	high	high	T-S
5. Selection of super- visors for student activities	low	low	high	S
6. Student body regu- lations	high	high	high	A-T-S
7. Evaluation of students	high	high	high	A-T-S
8. Evaluation of teachers	high	high	high	A-T-S
9. Evaluation of administrators	high	high	high	A-T-S
10. Attendance policy	low	low	low	N.C.
11. Late policy	low	low	low	N.C.
12. Student suspension	low	low	low	N.C.

Table 15 (continued)

Decision Items	Admin. Rank	Teacher Rank	Student Rank	Intended Decision- Making Group
13. Dismissal of a teacher	high	low	low	A
14. Parental contact concerning student	high	high	low	A-T
15. Classroom standards	high	low	low	A
16. Student dress regulations	low	low	low	N.C.
17. Student timetables	high	high	high	A-T-S
18. Expenditure of Student Union funds	low	low	high	S
19. Organization of staff meetings	low	low	low	N.C.
20. Subjects allotted to a teacher	high	high	low	A-T
21. Allocation of student awards	low	low	low	N.C.
22. Selection of a staff	high	high	high	A-T-S
23. Student cabinet	low	low	high	S
24. Staff cabinet	low	low	low	N.C.
25. School drug policy	high	high	high	A-T-S
26. Parental influence in the school	high	high	low	A-T

Table 15(continued)

Decision Items	Admin. Rank	Teacher Rank	Student Rank	Intended Decision- Making Group
27.Evaluation of Student Union Advisor	low	low	low	N.C.
28.Expenditure of School Board funds	high	high	high	A-T-S
29.Selection of a principal	high	low	high	A-S
30.Student-choice of a teacher	high	low	high	A-S

Six (6, 8, 9, 17, 28 and 30) of the eight (6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 17, 28 and 30) conflict decision items, identified on the Perceived and Preferred Subscales, seem to be substantiated by the high commitment shown by all three groups on the Intended Decision-Making Subscale. These six conflict items (6, 8, 9, 17, 28 and 30) appear to be of a latent nature (drives for autonomy) rather than felt conflicts (may arise from extra-organizational pressures) exhibited by the teachers and administrators on decision items 2, 14, 20 and 26 of the Intended Decision-Making Subscale. Six other less contentious latent conflict items, identified on the Intended Subscale, are decision items 1, 4, 7, 22, 25 and 29. It appears that from the original thirty decision items approximately two-thirds (1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 20, 22, 25, 28, 29 and 30) have remained as authentically contentious conflict items worthy of the close scrutiny of administrators.

These latent and felt conflicts, caused by the frequent decision-making differences of the three groups, were investigated further by determining the satisfaction levels of the three groups.

SATISFACTION ORIENTATIONS OF ADMINISTRATORS, TEACHERS AND STUDENTS

A satisfactory decision-making process maybe a pre-

requisite for a satisfied staff and clientele. Clarke (1970:95) found a high correlation ($r=.63$) between satisfied teachers and a satisfactory decision-making process. He also found the difference between the perceived and preferred decision-making of teachers was significantly greater for dissatisfied teachers than satisfied teachers. Consequently, discrepancies between different levels of group satisfaction may be indicative of more serious decision-making deficiencies with regard to different groups' occupational roles, school climate and the personnel within the school (Table 16).

Satisfaction and Decision-Making

There were no significant differences found between the satisfaction levels of the three groups with regard to each group's self-image and their relations with students. There was a significant difference found between the students and the other two groups on satisfaction with school climate, work progress, relations with administrators and relations with teachers (Table 16). The students appeared to be least satisfied with the school climate and administrator relations. The students' low satisfaction with the school climate may infer a dissatisfaction with the decision-making processes in their school. The high preference expressed by students for involvement in most decision items

Table 16

Percentage Frequencies and Mean Scores of
Administrators, Teachers and Students
on the Satisfaction Subscale
(N=168)

Satisfaction Items	Group	% of Satisfied Group	Mean Scores	p
1. Relations with students	Admin.	100	5.1	N.S.
	Teachers	98	5.1	
	Students	90	5.0	
2. Relations with teachers	Admin.	100	5.3	S
	Teachers	95	5.0	
	Students	79	4.4*	
3. Relations with administrators	Admin.	100	5.7	S
	Teachers	95	5.1	
	Students	61	3.9*	
4. Work progress	Admin.	89	4.6	S
	Teachers	87	4.6	
	Students	69	4.1*	
5. School climate	Admin.	78	4.4	S
	Teachers	88	4.6	
	Students	51	3.6*	
6. Self-image	Admin.	100	4.8	N.S.
	Teachers	93	4.7	
	Students	90	4.6	

*Differs significantly ($p < .05$) with other two groups.

on the Intended Subscale would seem to substantiate this position. Less than 10% of the teachers and administrators were dissatisfied with the items on the Satisfaction Subscale, while 49% of the students were dissatisfied with such items as school climate.

SUMMARY

Collectively, the three groups perceived most decisions external to the classroom as administrator-oriented, while decisions within the classroom were perceived as teacher-oriented. Student regulations, Student Union expenditures and extra-curricular programs were perceived as either student-oriented or shared decisions. Fifty-three percent of the decision items were perceived as administrator-oriented but only twenty-six percent of the items were preferred as administrator-oriented, forty percent were preferred as teacher-oriented, seventeen percent of the items were preferred as student-oriented and seventeen percent were preferred to be shared by the three groups.

Very few decision items were perceived by the three groups to have different decision-making orientations. However, the three groups preferred different decision-making orientations on approximately fifty-percent of the decision items, with seventeen percent of the decision items exhibit-

ing a different preferred decision-making orientation for all three groups. All groups preferred the shared or partially shared decision-making sources for almost all decision items.

All three groups were highly committed to thirty percent of the decision items but indicated a minimal commitment to another thirty percent of the decision items. One or two groups were highly committed to the remaining decision items. The high commitment indicated by various groups on the Intended Decision-Making Subscale seemed to substantiate some of the conflict decision items found on the Perceived and Preferred Decision-Making Subscales.

The student group exhibited the highest overall commitment and lowest satisfaction of the three groups. It would appear that teachers are already participating in many decisions and that students are aspiring to increase their autonomy by becoming members of the decision-making process.

CHAPTER 5

DECISION-MAKING ORIENTATIONS OF ADMINISTRATORS, TEACHERS AND STUDENTS IN DIFFERENT SCHOOLS

In this chapter, inter-school and intra-school comparisons are made of group members from each school to examine, (1) different decision-making patterns between different schools and (2) decision-making discrepancies between the groups within a school. These different decision-making orientations were analyzed on the three decision-making subscales using a similar research technique to that of Chapter 4. Possible relationships between the decision-making orientations and satisfaction levels of each group are also investigated. Finally, a brief summary is given for some of the findings in the chapter.

The findings of this chapter are related to the last four subproblems.

(5) What differences exist in the perceived, preferred and intended decision-making orientations in different schools?

(6) What relationship exists between different school decision-making orientations and member group satisfaction?

(7) What differences exist between the perceived, preferred and intended decision-making orientations of member groups within a school?

(8) What are some of the conflict decision items in a school?

DECISION-MAKING ORIENTATIONS OF DIFFERENT SCHOOLS

From each of the three schools, proportionate samples were selected, giving equivalent decision-making representation to each school. Twice as many staff (administrators and teachers) as students were selected from the original sample of each school. The larger representation of educators in each school gave a higher preference to the decision-making orientations of the educational experts and also allowed a cursory comparison with the decision-making orientations of the equal representation used in the previous chapter. These three collective school samples were then compared for discernible decision-making differences on the Perceived, Preferred and Intended Decision-Making Subscales.

After determining the different decision-making orientations of different schools, similar groups, from different schools, were compared to ascertain possible decision-making discrepancies which may have contributed to

the decision-making orientation of each school. Decision-making differences of identical groups, from different schools, were detected using the Chi-square test (x^2) on the Perceived and Preferred Subscales, while differences on the Intended Subscale were noted by comparing each group's mean using the Scheffé test. Only those decision items showing a significant difference between identical groups were recorded in this section.

Finally, relationships between the decision-making orientations and satisfaction levels of identical groups, from different schools, were investigated.

Perceived and Preferred Decision-Making Orientations of Different Schools

Sixteen of the thirty decision items (approximately 50%) had different decision-making orientations between one or more of the schools. At different schools, five decision items (4, 6, 16, 21 and 26) were perceived differently, nine (3, 5, 8, 9, 12, 17, 23, 27 and 30) were preferred to be directed using a different decision-making orientation and two decision items (10 and 14) were both perceived and preferred to have different decision-making orientations (Table 17).

Most of the different decision-making orientations (10 out of 16) between the schools, can be attributed to

Table 17

Categorization of the Percentage Frequencies of Each School
Sample with regard to Their Decision-Making Orienta-
tions on the Three
Subscales

Decision Item	School	Admin. Oriented		Teacher Oriented		Student Oriented		Shared	
		Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.
1.	A			82	98	A-T-S			
	B			93	98	A-T-S			
	C			77	94	A-T-S			
2.	A	93			95	T			
	B	93			100	T			
	C	97			91	T			
3.	A			100	93	N.C.			
	B			85		N.C.		54	
	C			94	91	N.C.			
4.	A								
	B					83	68	64	T-S
	C						50	58	T-S
5.	A			88				56	T-S
	B			91		86	N.C.		
	C			85		76	S	56	S

Table 17 (continued)

Decision Item	School	Admin. Oriented		Teacher Oriented		Student Oriented		Shared	
		Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.
6.	A							61	55 A-S
	B							63	68 A-T-S
	C	100							68 A-T-S
7.	A			100	95 A-T-S				
	B			93	100 A-T-S				
	C			91	100 A-T-S				
8.	A	75	77 A-T-S						
	B	63	A-T-S		83				
	C	74	76 A-T-S						
9.	A	N/A			95 A-T-S				51
	B	N/A			A-T-S				
	C	N/A			85 A-T-S				
10.	A	93			89 T				
	B			95	N.C.				56
	C	94			94 N.C.				
11.	A			87	87 N.C.				
	B			93	93 N.C.				
	C			70	88 N.C.				

Table 17 (continued)

Decision Item	School	Admin. Oriented		Teacher Oriented		Student Oriented		Shared	
		Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.
12.	A	93		93					N.C.
	B	98						54	S
	C	100						50	S
13.	A	57	93						
	B	58	100						
	C	88	100						
14.	A	95	84						
	B			98					
	C	94							
15.	A								
	B			98					
	C			95					
16.	A								
	B								
	C								
17.	A	98	85						
	B	91							
	C	97							
									61

Table 17 (continued)

Decision Item	School	Admin. Oriented		Teacher Oriented		Student Oriented		Shared	
		Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.
18.	A					84	93	S	
	B					88	100	S	
	C					91	94	S	
19.	A	86	98		N.C.				
	B	86	100		N.C.				
	C	97	100		N.C.				
20.	A	79		96	A-T				
	B	79		95	A-T				
	C	80		94	A-T				
21.	A			86					57 S.
	B	N/A							74 N.C.
	C	94							62 N.C.
22.	A	75	100		A-S				
	B	86	100		A-T-S				
	C	82	100		A-S				
23.	A	N/A				95	S		
	B	N/A					N.C.		51
	C	N/A				91	S		

Table 17 (continued)

Decision Item	School	Admin. Oriented		Teacher Oriented		Student Oriented		Shared	
		Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.
24.	A	N/A		93	T				
	B	N/A		95	N.C.				
	C	N/A		94	N.C.				
25.	A	68						66	A-T-S
	B	68						79	A-T
	C	70						62	A-S
26.	A	N/A						64	A-T
	B					56		77	A-T
	C	76						74	A-T
27.	A	59				91			N.C.
	B	54						54	N.C.
	C	68						50	N.C.
28.	A	77	100		A-T-S				
	B	84	98		A-T-S				
	C	85	97		A-T-S				
29.	A	N/A	84		A				
	B	N/A	91		A-T				
	C	N/A	82		A-S				

Table 17 (continued)

Decision Item	School	<u>Admin. Oriented</u>		<u>Teacher Oriented</u>		<u>Student Oriented</u>		<u>Shared</u>	
		Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.
30.	A	70	68	A-S					
	B	73		A-S					
	C	65	79	A-T-S		84			

School B, which had different decision-making orientations on ten decision items (3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 17, 23, 26 and 30). Two of School B's decision items (4 and 26) were perceived differently from the other two schools. Item 4 - Extra-curricular program, was perceived as student-oriented, while the other two schools perceived this item as shared and Item 26 - Parental influence in the school, was perceived as shared at School B but more administrative-oriented at the other two schools. Seven decision items at School B (3, 5, 8, 9, 17, 23 and 30) were given different preferred decision-making orientations than at the other schools. Five (3, 5, 9, 17 and 23) of the seven decision items were preferred to be shared at School B and Item 8 - Evaluation of teachers was preferred teacher-oriented, while Item 30 - Student-choice of a teacher, was preferred student-oriented. Item 10 - Attendance policy, was both perceived and preferred differently at School B than at the other two schools. One most striking observation from Table 17 was that almost all decision-making orientations at School B were both perceived and preferred at considerably lower decision sources, than at the other two schools.

Four of the different decision-making orientations between the schools can be attributed to School C's orienta-

tions on decision items 6, 14, 16 and 21. Decision items, 6 - Student body regulations, 16 - Student dress regulations and 21 - Allocation of student awards are all perceived as administrator-oriented at School C but preferred at a lower decision source, similar to the other schools. Schools A and B had different decision-making orientations (administrator and teacher) on Item 14 - Parental contact concerning student, but these orientations were what each school perceived and preferred. However, School C perceives Item 14 as administrator-oriented and preferred it to be teacher-oriented.

School A was responsible for two of the preferred different decision-making orientations on decision items 12 and 27. Decision Item 12 - Student suspension was preferred teacher-oriented rather than shared, like the other two schools. Decision Item 27 - Evaluation of Student Union Advisor was preferred student-oriented and not shared, as in Schools B and C.

All three schools exhibited a decision-making shift from the higher decision-making sources on the Perceived Subscale to the lower decision-making sources on the Preferred Subscale (Table 18). The higher proportion of educators used in the inter-school comparison doesn't seem to have affected the distributions of the decision-making

Table 18

Number of Decision Items Allotted to the Different
Decision-Making Orientations by Members of
Each School

School	Perceived Decision-Making Orientations			Preferred Decision-Making Orientations		
	Admin. Orient.	Teacher Orient.	Student Orient.	Admin. Orient.	Teacher Orient.	Student Orient.
A	14	7	2	5	9	5
B	12	8	3	5	5	3
C	18	6	1	4	8	4
Approx. Average of Schools	15	7	2	4	7	4
						8

orientations established in the first two sections of Chapter 4, using the equal sample. However, one noticeable change from the decision-making orientation of the equal sample to the educator-weighted sample was the increase in shared decision items, from five preferred decision items being shared to an average of eight preferably shared decision items.

The findings of the inter-school comparison (Table 18) seemed to indicate that member groups at School B, the individualized-instruction school, appeared to perceive and prefer much lower decision-making sources than either of the other schools. The greatest degree of parallelism was exhibited between the perceived and preferred decision-making orientations of School A, while School C group members appeared to prefer the greatest number of decision-making shifts from the administrator-oriented items on the Perceived Decision-Making Subscale.

Intended Decision-Making Orientations of Similar Groups from Different Schools

To determine the intended decision-making groups shown in Table 17, each group mean on the thirty decision items was ranked above (high) or below (low) the respective group's mean for that school (Tables 19, 20 and 21). For example, if the teacher group mean for a particular item, in

Table 19

Mean Scores on Decision Items of the Intended Decision-Making
Subscale Ranked by Teachers and Students
at School A
(N=54)

Teachers (n=38)			Students (n=16)		
Mean Hours Per Week	Item No.	Rank	Mean Hours Per Week	Item No.	Rank
0.70	7	1	1.15	4	1
0.60	1	2.5	1.05	1	2
0.60	28	2.5	0.75	18	3
0.55	4	4	0.70	25	4
0.50	25	5	0.65	6	7
0.45	8	6.5	0.65	7	7
0.45	14	6.5	0.65	8	7
0.40	2	8.5	0.65	23	7
0.40	20	8.5	0.65	30	7
0.35	9	12	0.55	9	11.5
0.35	10	12	0.55	21	11.5
0.35	17	12	0.55	22	11.5
0.35	24	12	0.55	28	11.5
0.35	26	12	0.50	10	14.5
0.30	6	18	0.50	20	14.5
0.30	12	18	0.45	3	18
0.30	13	18	0.45	5	18
0.30	18	18	0.45	15	18
0.30	19	18	0.45	17	18
0.30	21	18	0.45	27	18
0.30	22	18	0.40	13	21
0.25	15	23	0.35	12	23
0.25	23	23	0.35	16	23
0.25	30	23	0.35	26	23
0.20	3	26.5	0.30	14	25.5
0.20	5	26.5	0.30	29	25.5
0.20	16	26.5	0.25	11	27
0.20	29	26.5	0.20	2	28
0.15	11	29.5	0.15	19	29.5
0.15	27	29.5	0.15	24	29.5
0.35 Mean of Total			0.50 Mean of Total		

Table 20

Mean Scores on Decision Items of the Intended Decision-Making
Subscale Ranked by Teachers and Students
at School B
(N=39)

Teachers (n=25)			Students (n=14)		
Mean Hours Per Week	Item No.	Rank	Mean Hours Per Week	No.	Rank
0.55	28	1	1.30	22	1
0.50	1	3.5	1.25	8	2.5
0.50	7	3.5	1.25	30	2.5
0.50	8	3.5	1.20	28	4
0.50	9	3.5	1.10	6	6
0.45	14	6.5	1.10	9	6
0.45	17	6.5	1.10	17	6
0.40	2	10	1.05	7	8
0.40	13	10	1.00	1	9
0.40	22	10	0.95	18	11.5
0.40	25	10	0.95	4	11.5
0.40	26	10	0.95	12	11.5
0.35	4	14.5	0.95	13	11.5
0.35	6	14.5	0.90	5	14
0.35	20	14.5	0.85	27	17.5
0.35	29	14.5	0.85	10	17.5
0.30	3	19	0.85	20	17.5
0.30	10	19	0.85	21	17.5
0.30	12	19	0.85	23	17.5
0.30	15	19	0.85	26	17.5
0.30	30	19	0.80	15	22
0.25	5	23.5	0.80	25	22
0.25	18	23.5	0.80	29	22
0.25	19	23.5	0.60	3	24.5
0.25	24	23.5	0.60	24	24.5
0.20	11	27	0.55	11	26
0.20	23	27	0.50	14	27
0.20	27	27	0.40	2	28.5
0.15	21	29	0.40	16	28.5
0.10	16	30	0.25	19	30
0.34 Mean of Total			0.86 Mean of Total		

Table 21

Mean Scores of Decision Items of the Intended Decision-Making
Subscale Ranked by Teachers and Students
at School C
(N=66)

Teachers (n=19)			Students (n=47)		
Mean Hours Per Week	Item No.	Rank	Mean Hours Per Week	Item No.	Rank
0.80	1	1	1.35	4	1.5
0.75	7	2	1.35	6	1.5
0.65	4	3	1.20	25	3.5
0.50	14	4	1.20	30	3.5
0.45	8	6	1.15	9	5
0.45	20	6	1.10	8	6.5
0.45	28	6	1.10	17	6.5
0.40	2	8.5	1.05	7	10
0.40	9	8.5	1.05	18	10
0.35	6	11	1.05	22	10
0.35	26	11	1.05	23	10
0.35	30	11	1.05	29	10
0.30	10	14	1.00	1	14
0.30	12	14	1.00	5	14
0.30	15	14	1.00	28	14
0.25	22	17	0.95	12	16
0.25	25	17	0.90	10	17.5
0.25	29	17	0.90	13	17.5
0.20	3	22.5	0.85	14	19.5
0.20	11	22.5	0.85	21	19.5
0.20	13	22.5	0.80	16	22
0.20	17	22.5	0.80	20	22
0.20	18	22.5	0.80	27	22
0.20	19	22.5	0.75	11	25
0.20	21	22.5	0.75	15	25
0.20	24	22.5	0.75	24	25
0.15	5	27.5	0.65	3	27
0.15	16	27.5	0.60	2	28.5
0.10	23	29.5	0.60	26	28.5
0.10	27	29.5	0.45	19	30
0.32 Mean of Total			0.94 Mean of Total		

School A, was above the teachers group mean in School A, then that particular decision items was considered to have a high priority (rank) by the teachers of School A. This high teacher priority was simply denoted with a T beside the appropriate item, under the Intended Decision-Making Subscale. Because of the small number of administrators in each school, it was not feasible to establish the intended decision-making priorities (ranks) of each administrative group using non-representative samples of administrators.

There were no appropriate differences between the average intended commitment levels for identical groups, at the three schools, except for School A students who had a group mean of .50 hours/week compared to an average of .90 hours/week for the other two schools (Tables 19, 20 and 21). The average commitment of the three teacher groups from each school for the thirty decision items, was approximately the same; School A teachers - .35 hours/week, School B - teachers - .34 hours/week and School C teachers - .32 hours/week. (Tables 19, 20 and 21). In all three schools the student groups indicated a higher average commitment level than the other two groups.

The intended decision-making scores (Tables 19, 20 and 21), attained by identical groups from different schools, were compared on each decision item, using the Scheffé test. No significant differences were found between the intended commitment levels of either administrators or teachers, from different schools, on any of the thirty decision items. There were eight decision items (2, 5, 6, 12, 14, 17, 24 and 29) where the commitment level of students from School A was significantly ($p < .05$) lower than students of School C (Table 22). Because the commitment level of all students at School A was generally lower than students at either of the other schools, on almost all decision items, decision items of high priority (Tables 19, 20, and 21) were listed sequentially with comparisons being made between different schools (Table 23), for all three groups.

Fourteen decision items had the same high group commitments between teachers and/or students of the different schools, (Table 23). In the three schools, all three groups appeared highly committed to decision items 1, 7, 8, 9 and 28, administrators and teachers were committed to items 14, 20 and 26, teachers were committed to class-size, Item 2, teachers and students were committed to Item 4, all student groups showed commitment to items

Table 22

Decision Items, Exhibiting a Significant
Difference between Students of Dif-
ferent Schools on the Intended
Decision-Making Subscale
(N=77)

Decision Items	School	Intended Decision-Making Subscale	
		Mean Hrs/Week	% of each group willing to commit more time to item
2. Class size	A*	.20*	44
	B	.40	64
	C	.60	64
5. Selection of supervisors for student activi- ties	A*	.45*	50
	B	.90	79
	C	1.00	83
6. Student body regulations	A*	.65*	69
	B	1.10	71
	C	1.35	89
12. Student suspen- sion	A*	.35*	37
	B	.95	79
	C	.95	74
14. Parental con- tact concerning student	A*	.30*	37
	B	.50	64
	C	.85	74
17. Student time- tables	A*	.45*	56
	B	1.10	79
	C	1.10	79
24. Staff cabinet	A*	.15*	19
	B	.55	50
	C	.75	60

Table 22 (continued)

Decision Items	School	Intended Decision-Making Subscale	
		Mean Hrs/Week	% of each group willing to commit more time to item
29. Selection of a principal	A*	.30*	37
	B	.80	50
	C	1.05	77

*Students of School A differed significantly ($p < .05$) with those of School C.

Table 23

Comparison of High Priority Decision Items of
Teachers and Students at Different Schools

	Teachers			Students		
	School	School	School	School	School	School
	A	B	C	A	B	C
Decision Item Numbers	1	1	1	1	1	1
	2	2	2	4	4	4
	4	4	4		5	5
		6	6	6	6	6
	7	7	7	7	7	7
	8	8	8	8	8	8
	9	9	9	9	9	9
	10				12	12
		13			13	
	14	14	14		17	17
	17	17		18	18	18
	20	20	20	21		
		22		22	22	22
	24			23		23
	25	25		25		25
	26	26	26	28	28	28
	28	28	28			29
			30	30	30	30

6, 18, 22 and 30 and no group showed commitment to decision items 3, 11, 16, 19 and 27.

In addition to the common commitments of the students and other groups, cited above, students at School A were committed to three other decision items, Item 21 - Allocation of student awards, Item 23 - Student cabinet and Item 25 - School drug policy. School B students were committed to four other items, Item 5 - Selection of student supervisors, Item 12 - Student suspension, Item 13 - Dismissal of a teacher, and Item 17 - Student timetables. Students at School C expressed commitment for six additional items, not common to all schools; Item 5 - Selection of student supervisors, Item 12 - Student suspension, Item 17 - Student timetables, Item 23 - Student cabinet, Item 25 - School drug policy and Item 29 - Selection of a principal (Table 23). It appeared that students at School C were willing to commit more time (.94 hours/week) to a greater variety of decision items (six) than students at either School A or B.

Teachers at the three schools also exhibited different priorities of commitment on various decision items (Table 23). Besides the common decision items of high commitment among teachers of different schools, teachers at School A were committed to Item 10 - Attendance policy,

Item 17 - Student timetables, Item 24 - Staff cabinet and Item 25 - School drug policy. Teachers at School B expressed commitment for five additional decision items; Item 6 - Student body regulations, Item 13 - Dismissal of a teacher, Item 17 - Student timetables, Item 22 - Selection of staff and Item 25 - School drug policy. Teachers at School C expressed commitment for only two additional items; Item 6 - Student body regulations and Item 30 - Student-choice of a teacher. This would seem to imply that teachers at School B were willing to commit themselves to the greatest variety of decision items (five) and teachers at School C appeared committed to the least variety of decision items (two).

A final tabulation, on the Intended Subscale, was made of the number of items that each group had indicated commitment towards, at the different schools (Table 24). All three groups were committed to six decision items (1, 7, 8, 9, 25 and 28) at School A, nine items (1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 17, 22 and 28) at School B, and seven items (1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 28 and 30) at School C. One or two groups were committed to seventeen decision items at School A, twelve decision items at School B, and fifteen decision items at School C (Table 23). There were no groups committed to seven items at School A, nine items at School B and eight

items at School C (Table 24). It appeared that there were more decision items of mutual concern at School B than the other two schools.

Table 24

Number of Decision Items that Groups Intend to Commit Extra Time Towards on the Intended Decision-Making Subscale

School	Groups Intending To Commit Extra Time							
	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N.C.
A	3	4	3	6	1	3	3	7
B	1	5	1	9	1	1	3	9
C	2	3	4	7	1	1	4	8
Approx. Average per School	2	4	3	7	1	2	3	8

A brief synopsis of the Intended decision-making findings would seem to indicate that:

(1) students at School C were willing to commit more time to a greater variety of decision items than the other students.

(2) Teachers at School B were willing to commit themselves to a greater variety of decision items. Teachers and administrators at School B appeared to have closer mutual concerns about decision items (Item 13 - Dismissal of a

teacher) that had been the concern of administrators only.

Different Perceived and Preferred Decision-Making Orientations
of Similar Groups from Different Schools

Only eleven of the thirty decision items outlined in Table 17 of the first subsection had the same perceived and preferred decision-making orientations in the different schools. To determine some of the underlying causes of the perceived and preferred decision-making discrepancies between the different schools on the remaining nineteen decision items, it was necessary to compare identical groups from different schools. Some of the nineteen seemingly different decision-making orientations between the schools were not significantly different, when the chosen decision-making sources of identical school groups were compared on the Perceived and Preferred Subscales (Tables 25 and 26). This can be attributed to common decision-making groups within different decision-making orientations. For example, administrator-oriented decision items include the A-T and A-T-S decision-making groups, which are also common to teacher-oriented decision items. Therefore, if one decision item is teacher-oriented and another is administrator-oriented, they may not be significantly different because of their similar group decision-making loadings on the A-T and A-T-S responses. Item 8 - Evaluation of teachers is an

Table 25

Significant Differences between Teachers of the Three Schools
on the Perceived and Preferred Subscales with regard to
Various Decision Items
(N=82)

Decision Items * School	% of Perceived Decision-Making Groups						% of Preferred Decision-Making Groups					
	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	A	A-T	A-T-S	T-S	T	
2. Class size	A	63	34									
	B	36	60									
	C	90										
3. Homework frequency	A				26	71						
	B				40	36						
	C				21	74						
5. Selection of supervisors for student activities	A		34		32	18						
	B				48	24						
	C		37		32							
6. Student body regulations	A				66							
	B				68							
	C	21	32		42							
10. Attendance policy	A		71					55	24			
	B		56	24				20	60	16		
	C	53	47					42	53			

Table 25 (continued)

Decision Items* School	% of Perceived Decision-Making Groups				% of Preferred Decision-Making Groups			
	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	A	A-T
	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	A	A-T
11. Late policy	A	40			34		21	42
	B	28		16	48		48	20
	C	21	47		26		47	42
14. Parental contact concerning student	A	29	63				29	50
	B	64		24				56
	C	26	63					63
17. Student time-tables	A	50	32					
	B	24	28	36				
	C	68	26					
19. Organization of staff meetings	A	40	58					
	B	20	64					
	C	68	26					
21. Allocation of student awards	A	47		24				
	B	16		28				
	C	32		53				
26. Parental influence in	A	21						
	B	32	16	48				
	C	37	37					

Table 25 (continued)

Decision Items* School	% of Perceived Decision-Making Groups				% of Preferred Decision-Making Groups			
	A		A-T		A		A-T	
	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	A-T-S	T-S T
28. Expenditure of School Board funds	A 21 B 40 C 42	74 44 32						
30. Student-choice of a teacher	A 45 B 20 C 47		16	36				

*Decision items showing a significant difference between teachers of different schools at $p < .05$

Frequencies less than 15% are not recorded.

Table 26

Significant Differences between Students of the Three Schools on the Perceived and Preferred Subscales with regard to Various Decision Items
(N=77)

Decision Items*	School	% of Perceived Decision-Making										% of Preferred Decision-Making			
		Groups					Groups					Groups			
		A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	A	A-S	A-T-S	A	A-S	A-T-S	S
2. Class size	A	44	44												
	B		50												
	C	57	36												
					21										
3. Homework frequency	A						31	69							
	B						36	36							
	C						26	60							
7. Evaluation of students	A		75					19							
	B						29	43							
	C		34					45							
10. Attendance policy	A		81												
	B		50								21				
	C	34	43												
12. Student suspension	A	25	50												
	B		57								29				
	C	47	28								21				

Table 26 (continued)

Decision Items*	School	% of Perceived Decision-Making % of Preferred Decision-Making									
		Groups					Groups				
		A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	A	A-S	A-T-S S
16. Student dress regulations	A			50		19					
	B			21		64					
	C	38		21		21					
17. Student time-tables	A	44		25	19				25	44	19
	B		50								50
	C	51	15	17					21		45
19. Organization of staff meetings	A	19	38								
	B		43								
	C	43	38								
26. Parental influence in the school	A		31		25						
	B				71						
	C	21	21		17						
28. Expenditure of School Board funds	A	31									
	B	21	21	36							
	C	60									
30. Student-choice of a teacher	A	50									
	B	21		36							
	C	57									

*Differences between schools was significant at $p < .05$.
 Frequencies less than 15% are not recorded.

example of such an item, it has a different decision-making orientation at School B (Table 17) but not significantly different decision-making sources between the schools.

Teachers perceived that thirteen decision items had significantly different decision-making sources in the three schools (Table 25). On almost all significantly different decision items, it appears that teachers at School B perceive their school as having the lowest sources of decision-making (A-T, A-T-S and T-S), School C teachers feel they have the highest sources of decision-making (A, A-T and A-S), while teachers at School A seem to occupy the intermediate position. Teachers at the three schools preferred the same decision-making sources (see Table 39, Appendix B) on almost all decision items, except for three items: Item 10 - Attendance policy, Item 11 - Late policy and Item 14 - Parental contact concerning a student (Table 25). Teachers at School B preferred the attendance policy and late policy to be more shared (A-T-S) or partially shared (T-S) than teachers at the other two schools. Teachers at School A preferred Item 14 - Parental contact to remain administrator-oriented, while teachers at School B and C preferred it to be A-T or A-T-S oriented.

There were eleven decision items perceived as having significantly different decision-making sources by students

of the different schools but only one item was preferred to have a significantly different decision-making source by students of different schools (Table 26). A greater degree of parallelism seemed to exist between the perceived decision-making sources of students and teachers at School B. Both students and teachers at School B perceived more shared and partially shared decision-making than either group at the other schools. Students at Schools A and C accredited many more decision items to the administrative decision-making source (A and A-T) than students at School B (Table 26).

After comparing identical groups from different schools, some of the earlier suppositions seemed to be substantiated:

(1) Identical group members from different schools, did perceive that their schools have different decision-making orientations.

(2) Identical group members from different schools preferred similar decision-making orientations. Only one decision item was preferred to have a different decision-making source by the students of different schools and only three by the teachers.

Comparison of Satisfaction Levels of Similar Groups from Different Schools

Teachers from the three schools did not differ

significantly in their satisfaction with; (1) self-image, (2) relations with fellow teachers and (3) relations with students in their schools (Table 27). Teachers at School C had a lower satisfaction level with administrative relations, than the teachers at the other two schools. Teachers at School B were less satisfied with their work progress and school climate, than teachers at the other two schools. Teachers at School A appeared to be the most satisfied, with an average satisfaction score of 5.1. Second, were teachers from School C with an average satisfaction level of 4.8 and third, teachers from School B, with an average satisfaction of 4.6.

Students in the different schools did not differ significantly in their satisfaction with; (1) fellow student relations, (2) work progress and (3) self-image (Table 28). Students at School B were more satisfied with teacher relations, administrator relations and school climate than students at either School A or School C. The average satisfaction level of students from School B was the highest, 4.7, while students from School A and C had an average of 4.1.

The satisfaction scores would seem to indicate that School B had the most satisfied students and the least satisfied staff, while the opposite appeared true for the other two schools.

Table 27

Percentage Frequencies and Mean Scores of
Teachers from Different Schools on
the Satisfaction Subscale
(N=82)

Satisfaction Items	School	% of Satisfied Group	Mean Score	p
1. Relations with students	A	100	5.1	
	B	92	5.0	N.S.
	C	100	5.3	
2. Relations with teachers	A	100	5.3	
	B	88	4.9	N.S.
	C	95	4.8	
3. Relations with administrators	A	97	5.5	
	B	96	5.0	S
	C	89	4.5*	
4. Work progress	A	92	4.8	
	B	72	4.1**	S
	C	95	4.9	
5. School climate	A	100	4.9	
	B	72	4.3***	S
	C	84	4.5	
6. Self-image	A	95	4.8	
	B	84	4.5	N.S.
	C	100	4.8	

*School C teachers differed significantly (p .05) from
School A teachers

**School B teachers differed significantly (p .05) from
School B teachers

***School B teachers differed significantly (p .05) from
School A teachers

Table 28

Percentage Frequencies and Mean Scores of
Students from Different Schools on the
Satisfaction Subscale
(N=77)

Satisfaction Items	School	% of Satisfied Group	Mean Score	p
1. Relations with students	A	75	4.6	N.S.
	B	93	5.1	
	C	94	5.0	
2. Relations with teachers	A	81	4.4	S
	B	100	5.2*	
	C	72	4.1	
3. Relations with administrators	A	56	3.9	S
	B	93	4.6*	
	C	53	3.6	
4. Work progress	A	75	3.9	N.S.
	B	57	3.4	
	C	70	4.3	
5. School climate	A	66	3.3	S
	B	100	4.7**	
	C	44	3.3	
6. Self-image	A	87	4.6	N.S.
	B	100	5.1	
	C	87	4.4	

*School B students differed significantly ($p .05$) from School C students

**School B students differed significantly ($p < .05$) from other students

At the risk of oversimplifying, the comparison of the different schools would seem to indicate:

(1) School A was probably the most stable school, requiring the least amount of decision-making change. There was moderate parallelism between the perceived and preferred decision-making orientations of the school. The low commitment levels of the students and high satisfaction of the teachers do not seem to threaten the present decision-making orientations of this school.

(2) School B appeared to be the least administrator-oriented school, where both students and teachers seemed to perceive and prefer more mutual decision-making. Teachers at this school appeared to have high decision-making aspirations and were interested in participating in almost every decision affecting the school. The slightly lower satisfaction of the teachers coupled with their high drive for autonomy will probably not cause any internal dissent, if they can maintain the high satisfaction of the students.

(3) School C seems to be the most administrator-oriented school, where the member groups preferred the decision-making to become more cooperative. The intermediate satisfaction of the teachers coupled with the high commitment but low satisfaction of the students may not create any internal conflicts, if the students could be

given increased participation in the school's decision-making.

DECISION-MAKING DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN DIFFERENT GROUPS WITHIN EACH SCHOOL

The inter-school comparison, of the previous section, (1) identified the different decision-making orientations of different schools and (2) revealed the cohesion exhibited by identical member groups, from different schools, for similar preferred decision-making sources. These two factors coupled with the findings of Chapter 4 (Table 12), that different groups prefer different decision-making orientations, implies that several areas of conflict are possible within a school.

This section deals with an intra-school comparison of member groups, within each school. The purpose of this section is to identify possible areas of conflict within each school, implementing the same research techniques used in Chapter 4.

Each decision-making subscale, including the Satisfaction Subscale, was analyzed and significant differences between the different groups were noted. Those items which exhibited the greatest number of significant differences on the different subscales were considered the most contentious decision items, in each school.

DECISION-MAKING WITHIN SCHOOL A

Perceived Decision-Making Discrepancies of Groups within School A

There were five decision items (1, 6, 19, 20 and 28) that the three groups perceived as having different decision-making sources (Table 29). Only one of these decision items, Item 1 - Extent of knowledge to be taught, appeared to be significantly different when the different decision-making sources were combined into the perceived decision-making orientations (Table 30). It would appear that there are very few decision-making discrepancies perceived by the member groups of School A.

Preferred Decision-Making Discrepancies of Groups within School A

There were ten decision items (3, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 20, 22 and 28) where the three groups preferred different decision-making sources (Table 29). Teachers and students seemed to be opposed on the appropriate decision-making source for decision items 3, 8, 10, 11 and 16. The teachers preferred these decision-items to be more teacher-oriented, while the students also preferred more personal decision-making authority (Table 29). Teachers and students prefer, Item 13 - Dismissal of a teacher, Item 17 - Student timetables and Item 22 - Selection of staff, to remain ad-

Table 29

Decision Items Showing a Significant Difference between Administrators, Teachers and Students at School A (N=56)

Decision Items	Group	% of Perceived Decision-Making Groups					% of Preferred Decision-Making Groups							
		A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S
1. Extent of knowledge to be taught	A						100							
	T		21			21	34					26	61	100
	S	19	44	25								63	19	
3. Homework frequency	A													
	T													
	S													
6. Student body regulations	A				50	50								
	T				66									
	S			31	56									
8. Evaluation of teachers	A					50		50			50			
	T					40					32			
	S								44		19			
10. Attendance	A										100			
	T					55					24			
	S										31	31	25	

Table 29 (continued)

Decision Items	Group	% of Perceived Decision-Making Groups					% of Preferred Decision-Making Groups							
		A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S
22. Selection of staff	A													
	T							42	47					
	S							44			31			
28. Expenditure of School Board funds	A	N/A						50			50			
	T	21	74						81					
	S	N/A						19	38		38			

*Decision Items show a significant difference at $p < .05$
Frequencies less than 15% are not recorded.

Table 30

Categorization of the Percentage Frequencies of Each Group at School A
with regard to Their Decision-Making Orientations on
the Three Subscales
(N=56)

Decision Item	Group	Admin. Oriented		Teacher Oriented		Student Oriented		Shared	
		Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.
1.	A (n=2)			100				50	H
	T (n=38)			79	97				H
	S (n=16)	88			94				H
2.	A (n=2)	100			100	L			
	T (n=38)	97			95	H			
	S (n=16)	88			100	L			
3.	A (n=2)			100	100	L			
	T (n=38)			100	100	L			
	S (n=16)			100	81	L			
4.	A (n=2)							50	L
	T (n=38)							53	H
	S (n=16)							75	H
5.	A (n=2)								
	T (n=38)			90				50	L
	S (n=16)					71	94	55	L
									L

Table 30 (continued)

Decision Item	Group	Admin. Oriented		Teacher Oriented		Student Oriented		Shared	
		Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.
6.	A (n=2)							50	100
	T (n=38)							66	63
	S (n=16)					100		56	
7.	A (n=2)			100					50
	T (n=38)			97	97				
	S (n=16)			100	88				
8.	A (n=2)	100						50	
	T (n=38)	76			92				
	S (n=16)	62	87						
9.	A (n=2)	N/A						50	
	T (n=38)	N/A			92				
	S (n=16)	N/A			94				
10.	A (n=2)	100							100
	T (n=38)	93			97				
	S (n=16)	94				88			
11.	A (n=2)			100					100
	T (n=38)			84	97				
	S (n=16)			81		81			

Table 30 (continued)

Decision Item	Group	Admin. Oriented		Teacher Oriented		Student Oriented		Shared	
		Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.
12.	A(n=2)	100			L			50	
	T(n=38)	93		92	L				
	S(n=16)	87			L			50	
13.	A(n=2)	50	100	H					
	T(n=38)	55	92	L					
	S(n=16)	62	94	L					
14.	A(n=2)	100		H				50	
	T(n=38)	95	92	H					
	S(n=16)	94		L	88				
15.	A(n=2)			H					
	T(n=38)			L	97	100		50	
	S(n=16)			L	94	88			
16.	A(n=2)						50	50	L
	T(n=38)						70	50	L
	S(n=16)						87	50	L
17.	A(n=2)	100	100	H					
	T(n=38)	97	95	H					
	S(n=16)	94		L					75

Table 30 (continued)

Decision Item	Group	Admin. Oriented		Teacher Oriented		Student Oriented		Shared	
		Perc.	Int.	Perc.	Int.	Perc.	Int.	Perc.	Int.
18.	A(n=2)					100	100	L	
	T(n=38)					81	92	L	
	S(n=16)					94	94	H	
19.	A(n=2)	50	100						
	T(n=38)	100	97						
	S(n=16)	69		100					
20.	A(n=2)	100			H				
	T(n=38)	89		100	H				
	S(n=16)	50	94		L				
21.	A(n=2)			100				L	100
	T(n=38)			89				L	50
	S(n=16)			88				H	56
22.	A(n=2)	50	100		H				
	T(n=38)	79	100		L				
	S(n=16)	69	100		H				
23.	A(n=2)	N/A						L	50
	T(n=38)	N/A						L	89
	S(n=16)	N/A						H	94

Table 30 (continued)

Decision Item	Group	Admin. Oriented		Teacher Oriented		Student Oriented		Shared	
		Perc.	Int.	Perc.	Int.	Perc.	Int.	Perc.	Int.
24.	A (n=2)	N/A		100	L				
	T (n=38)	N/A		95	H				
	S (n=16)	N/A		88	L				
25.	A (n=2)	50						100	H
	T (n=38)	71						61	H
	S (n=16)	69						75	H
26.	A (n=2)								
	T (n=38)	47						100	H
	S (n=16)	62						50	H
27.	A (n=2)	100						81	L
	T (n=38)	45						100	L
	S (n=16)	63				88		50	L
28.	A (n=2)	N/A							
	T (n=38)	97	100					50	H
	S (n=16)	56	100						H
29.	A (n=2)	N/A							
	T (n=38)	N/A	84					50	H
	S (n=16)	N/A	81						H

Table 30 (continued)

Decision Item	Group	<u>Admin. Oriented</u>		<u>Teacher Oriented</u>		<u>Student Oriented</u>		<u>Shared</u>	
		Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.
30.	A(n=2)	100						50	H
	T(n=38)	68	82						L
	S(n=16)	75				75			H

administrator-oriented, while the administrators preferred these items to be partially shared between the administrator and teacher (Table 29). Students preferred, Item 20 - Subjects allotted to a teacher and Item 28 - Expenditure of School Board funds, to remain administrator-oriented, while teachers preferred these items to be partially shared between the administrators and teachers (Table 29).

There are other decision-making discrepancies, of a less contentious nature, depicted by the preferred decision-making orientations of the three groups (Table 30). Students expressed a high preference for Item 5 - Selection of student supervisors, Item 6 - Student body regulations and Item 30 - Student-choice of a teacher. Student preference for the latter decision item might indicate their concern about the instructional program.

Several groups expressed preferences for shared decision-making on some of the decision items (Tables 29 and 30). Because the shared decision-making preference was probably the most amenable decision-making source for all groups, it was not considered as a contentious decision-making discrepancy on the preferred subscale.

Intended Decision-Making Discrepancies of Groups within School A

Seven decision items (3, 5, 11, 12, 16, 19 and 27)

did not have the high commitment of any group at School A (Table 30). Teachers at School A had high commitment for fourteen decision items (1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 17, 20, 24, 25, 26, and 28), Students were highly committed to thirteen items (1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 18, 21, 22, 23, 25, 28 and 30) and administrators were committed to sixteen decision items (1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 17, 20, 22, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 30). The teachers and students appear to have mutual commitment to seven decision items (1, 4, 7, 8, 9, 25 and 28). Students appear to express high concern about teacher competence, by desiring to commit more time to such items as Item 8 - Evaluation of teachers, Item 22 - Selection of a staff and Item 30 - Student-choice of a teacher. Both students and teachers appear to be seeking more decision-making autonomy by selecting such items as; Item 23 - Student cabinet for the students and Item 24 - Staff cabinet for teachers. Teachers, at School A, indicated that they would like to devote more time to parental contact (Item 14) and parental influence (Item 26) in the school. The teachers also appear quite concerned about class size (Item 2) and attendance policies (Item 10) in the school.

In conclusion, it appears that the larger member groups at School A, students and teachers, preferred more decision-making autonomy (Items 23 and 24). Students at

School A are willing to commit more time to: (1) Student-oriented or shared decision items (4, 6, 18, 21 and 25) and (2) the evaluation of teachers (8, 22 and 30). The teachers at School A were concerned about the teacher-oriented decision items (1, 2, 7, and 20), parental influence (14 and 26) and former administrator decisions (10, 17 and 28). The most contentious decision items on all three decision-making subscales at School A appeared to be decision items 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28 and 30.

Satisfaction Discrepancies of Groups within School A

Administrators and teachers did not differ significantly in their levels of satisfaction (Chapter 4). Consequently, no comparison was attempted on the satisfaction subscale using the small number of administrators in School A. There were noticeable differences between the satisfaction levels of teachers and students in School A (Table 31). Students were less satisfied with; teacher relations, administrator relations, their work progress and the school climate, than teachers. Significant differences between the satisfaction of teachers and students with regard to their self-image and student relations were not found (Table 31). It would appear that teachers are satisfied with the decision-making processes of their school, but the students

Table 31

Percentage Frequencies and Mean Scores of
Teachers and Students from School A on
the Satisfaction Subscale
(N=54)

Satisfaction Items	Group	% of Satisfied Group	Mean Score	p
1. Relations with students	T	100	5.1	
	S	75	4.6	N.S.
2. Relations with teachers	T	100	5.3	
	S	81	4.4	S*
3. Relations with administrators	T	97	5.5	
	S	56	3.9	S*
4. Work progress	T	92	4.8	
	S	75	3.9	S*
5. School climate	T	100	4.9	
	S	56	3.3	S*
6. Self-image	T	95	4.8	
	S	87	4.6	N.S.

*Groups differ significantly from each other ($p < .05$)

are not as highly satisfied.

The intra-school analysis of School A on the four subscales would appear to indicate that the teachers may be attaining their professional aspirations at the expense of the student groups. The low commitment (.50 hours/week) and satisfaction levels of the students at School A may be indicative of apathy amongst the students. Student concern about teacher competence at School A may be one way of striking back at teacher indifference to various student activities. The teachers at School A may be falling victim to the type of role displacement that Kratzman (1970:130) warns educators about:

As teachers become more professional, we had better beware that individual teachers do not merely substitute a professional hierarchy for the currently constituted legal ones.

DECISION-MAKING WITHIN SCHOOL B

Perceived Decision-Making Discrepancies of Groups within School B

Six decision items (1, 18, 19, 22, 27 and 28) were perceived by the three groups at School B to have significantly different decision-making sources (Table 32). However, not all of these decision-making differences were noticed when the decision-making sources were combined into the various decision-making orientations (Table 33). With

Table 32

Decision Items Showing a Significant Difference between
Administrators, Teachers and Students at School B
(N=43)

Decision Items *	Group	% of Perceived Decision-Making % of Preferred Decision-Making												
		Groups						Groups						
		A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	A	A-T	A-T-S	T-S	T	S
1. Extent of knowledge to be taught	A	50		25	25					100				
	T	24			16		44				56	24		
	S	64		29						21	50	29		
7. Evaluation of student	A													
	T													
	S													
10.Attendance policy	A									100				
	T							20		60	16			
	S									36	43		21	
11.Late policy	A									100				
	T							20		48	24			
	S									36	43		21	
16.Student dress regulations	A									25			75	
	T									60	20		20	
	S									21			71	

Table 32 (continued)

Decision Items* Group	% of Perceived Decision-Making										% of Preferred Decision-Making			
	Groups					Groups					Groups			
	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	A	A-T	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	
18. Expenditure of Student Union funds	A			25	50	25								
	T		24	36	20									
	S						57							
19. Organization of staff meetings	A		25	25										
	T	50												
	S	20	64											
			43											
22. Selection of a staff	A	25	75						100					
	T	52	44					20	68					
	S	43	21					43		43				
24. Staff cabinet	A								25	75				
	T								84					
	S								43					
27. Evaluation of Student Union advisor	A	50			25									
	T	20		40										
	S			21	21	43								
28. Expenditure of School Board funds	A	75		25					50	50				
	T	40	44						88					
	S	21	21	36					21	57				

Table 32 (continued)

Decision Items * Group	% of Perceived Decision-Making										% of Preferred Decision-Making			
	Groups								Groups					
	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	A	A-T	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	
29. Selection of a principal	A	N/A						24	25	75				
	T	N/A						36	64					
	S	N/A								43	21			

*Decision Items show a significant difference at $p < .05$.

Table 33

Categorization of the Percentage Frequencies of Each Group at School B
with regard to Their Decision-Making Orientations
on the Three Subscales
(N=43)

Decision Item	Group	Admin. Oriented		Teacher Oriented		Student Oriented		Shared	
		Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.
1.	A (n=4)			100				50	H
	T (n=25)			88	100				H
	S (n=14)			100				50	H
2.	A (n=4)	100			100	L			
	T (n=25)	96			100	H			
	S (n=14)	93			100	L			
3.	A (n=4)			100	100	L			
	T (n=25)			76	100	L			
	S (n=14)			79	93	L			
4.	A (n=4)						100	50	L
	T (n=25)						80	64	H
	S (n=14)							57	H
5.	A (n=4)							50	
	T (n=25)			88				50	L
	S (n=14)			93				64	L
						100			H

Table 33 (continued)

Decision Item	Group	Admin. Oriented		Teacher Oriented		Student Oriented		Shared	
		Perc.	Int.	Perc.	Int.	Perc.	Int.	Perc.	Int.
6.	A (n=4)							75	75
	T (n=25)							68	84
	S (n=14)					93		50	
7.	A (n=4)			100	100				
	T (n=25)			96	100				
	S (n=14)			86	100				
8.	A (n=4)	100						75	
	T (n=25)	60			96				
	S (n=14)	57	79						
9.	A (n=4)	N/A						75	
	T (n=25)	N/A			96				
	S (n=14)	N/A						50	
10.	A (n=4)			100				100	L
	T (n=25)			96				60	L
	S (n=14)			93		100			L
11.	A (n=4)			100				100	
	T (n=25)			100	100				
	S (n=14)			86		100			

Table 33 (continued)

Decision Item	Group	Admin. Oriented		Teacher Oriented		Student Oriented		Shared	
		Perc.	Int.	Perc.	Int.	Perc.	Int.	Perc.	Int.
18.	A (n=4)					100	100		
	T (n=25)					100	100		L
	S (n=14)					100	100		L
19.	A (n=4)	100			L			75	
	T (n=25)	96		96	L				
	S (n=14)	64		100	L				
20.	A (n=4)			100	H			50	
	T (n=25)	88		100	H				
	S (n=14)		93	64	L				
21.	A (n=4)	N/A						100	L
	T (n=25)	N/A						68	L
	S (n=14)	N/A						79	L
22.	A (n=4)	100	100						H
	T (n=25)	96	100						H
	S (n=14)	64	100						H
23.	A (n=4)	N/A						100	L
	T (n=25)	N/A						56	L
	S (n=14)	N/A					93		L

Table 33 (continued)

Decision Item	Group	Admin. Oriented		Teacher Oriented		Student Oriented		Shared		
		Perc.	Pref.	Int.	Perc.	Pref.	Int.	Perc.	Pref.	Int.
24.	A (n=4)	N/A								
	T (n=25)	N/A			100		L			75
	S (n=14)	N/A			86		L			
25.	A (n=4)	50								
	T (n=25)	64								100
	S (n=14)	79								80
26.	A (n=4)									71
	T (n=25)									H
	S (n=14)									H
27.	A (n=4)	50								L
	T (n=25)	64								L
	S (n=14)									L
28.	A (n=4)	100								
	T (n=25)	84								50
	S (n=14)	79								H
29.	A (n=4)	N/A								
	T (n=25)	N/A								75
	S (n=14)	N/A								

Table 33 (continued)

Decision Item	Group	Admin. Oriented		Teacher Oriented		Student Oriented		Shared	
		Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.
30.	A (n=4)	75						100	H
	T (n=25)	84						52	L
	S (n=14)			64		86			H

reference to Tables 32 and 33, it would appear that teachers perceived decision items 19, 20, 22 and 28 to be more administrator-oriented than the administrators. Both students and teachers perceived that decision items 5, 12 and 17 were more administrator or teacher-oriented, while the administrators felt these items were shared (A-T-S). Teachers perceived Item 1 - Extent of knowledge to be taught, to be more teacher-oriented (Table 32) than students and administrators. Students perceived Item 27 - Evaluation of the Student Union Advisor, to be student-oriented, while administrators and teachers perceived it to be administrator-oriented.

It appeared that the administrators at School B perceived of more shared decision-making than either the students or teachers.

Preferred Decision-Making Discrepancies of Groups within School B.

There were eight decision items (7, 10, 11, 16, 22, 24, 28 and 29) which the three groups at School B, preferred to have significantly different decision-making sources (Table 32). Decision items, 7 - Evaluation of students and 16 - Student dress regulations, were items where the teachers desired a higher decision-making source but the administrators preferred a lower decision-making source (A-T-S or S). There appeared to be a slight conflict

between the teachers and students over the attendance and late policies (10 and 11), where teachers preferred more teacher-orientation on the items and students preferred more student autonomy on these matters. Teachers preferred decision items 24, 28 and 29 to be more administrator-teacher oriented (A-T), while administrators preferred these items to be shared (A-T-S).

Teachers at School B preferred decision items 8, 9, 15 and 20 to be teacher-oriented (Table 33) and the students preferred decision items 5 and 30 to become student-oriented. The member groups at School B preferred to return three decision items (8, 12 and 20) to the decision-making domain of the administrator; Students preferred Items 8 - Evaluation of teacher and 20 - Subjects allotted to a teacher to be administrator-oriented. Teachers preferred Item 12 - Student suspension to remain administrator-oriented.

The findings on the Preferred Decision-Making Subscale, seemed to imply that the students and teachers at School B were both seeking more decision-making authority but the teachers appeared to be somewhat hesitant about the decision-making responsibilities of the students, as indicated by the slight conflict on decision items 10 and 11. There were also indications (8, 12 and 20) that teachers and students at School B were willing to place more collegial de-

pendence upon the decision-making competence of the administrators.

Intended Decision-Making Discrepancies of Groups within School B

There were ten decision items (1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 17, 22 and 28) that both the students and teachers had mutually high commitments toward (Table 33). This represented more areas of mutual concern at School B, than either of the other two schools. Students and teachers at School B expressed less concern about a greater number of decision items (3, 10, 11, 16, 19, 21, 23, 24 and 27) than either of the groups at the other schools. Teachers at School B were committed to fifteen decision items (1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 17, 20, 22, 25, 26, and 28) while students were committed to fourteen decision items (1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 17, 18, 22, 28 and 30). Because of the large number of decision items (ten) of mutual concern to both teachers and students, it appears that it would be rather difficult to make a decision at School B without the advice and consultation of the schools' member groups.

Student and teacher commitments at School B were very similar to those of School A: Students appeared to express high concern about teacher competence (Items 8, 13, 22 and 30) and student-oriented items (5, 12 and 18). Tea-

chers were concerned about class size (2), parental influence (14 and 26) and the subjects allotted to a teacher (20). One obvious difference between the students and teachers of Schools A and B was the lack of high commitment, expressed by both teachers and students at School B, toward the establishment of either a staff or student cabinet (Items 23 and 24). This may imply that both students and teachers at School B feel they have enough decision-making autonomy and consequently, these items may no longer have a high priority, worthy of any additional time.

In conclusion, it appeared that students and teachers at School B felt they had enough decision-making autonomy (Items 23 and 24) but each group felt the other should be more accountable for its decision-making responsibility (Items 4, 6, 7, 8, 13, 17, 22 and 30). Mutually high commitments expressed by the groups for a large number of decision items would seem to indicate that School B is approaching the collegial school cabinet, that many educators support (Blumberg, 1969). At School B, the most contentious decision items on the three decision-making subscales, appeared to be items 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 17, 20, 22, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 30.

Satisfaction Discrepancies of Groups within School B

There were no significant differences found between

satisfaction levels of the member groups at School B, except with regard to self-image (Table 34). It appears that the students at School B have a higher self-image than the teachers. It should be recalled that students at School B scored significantly higher on 50% of the satisfaction items (Table 28) than students from other schools. It would appear that both students and teachers are quite highly satisfied with School B.

The intra-school analysis of School B, on the four subscales, would seem to indicate that the member groups of this school would prefer to use shared decision-making to resolve many of their mutual problems. The high commitment and satisfaction levels of the member groups at this school seem to be compatible with the high demands of cooperative decision-making.

DECISION-MAKING WITHIN SCHOOL C

Perceived Decision-Making Discrepancies of Groups within School C

Four decision items (8, 10, 11 and 16) were perceived, by the three groups at School C, to have significantly different decision-making sources (Table 35). Item 8 - Evaluation of teachers, Item 10 - Attendance policy, Item 11 - Late policy and Item 16 - Student dress regulations were perceived by the administrators to be shared but the

Table 34

Percentage Frequencies and Mean Scores of
Teachers and Students from School B on
the Satisfaction Subscale
(N=39)

Satisfaction Items	Group	% of Satisfied Group	Mean Score	p
1. Relations with students	T	92	5.0	
	S	93	5.1	N.S.
2. Relations with teachers	T	88	5.0	
	S	100	5.2	N.S.
3. Relations with administrators	T	96	5.0	
	S	93	4.6	N.S.
4. Work progress	T	72	4.1	
	S	57	3.6	N.S.
5. School climate	T	72	4.2	
	S	100	4.7	N.S.
6. Self-image	T	84	4.5	
	S	100	5.1	S*

*Groups differ significantly from each other ($p < .05$)

Table 35

Decision Items Showing a Significant Difference between
Administrators, Teachers and Students at School C
(N=69)

Decision Items* Group	% of Perceived Decision-Making % of Preferred Decision-Making									
	Groups					Groups				
	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T S	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T S
2. Class size	A					33	67			
	T						79			16
	S						19		28	26 17
4. Extra-curricular program	A						16		100	
	T								68	
	S								30	15 43
5. Selection of student supervisors	A								100	
	T						37		42	16
	S								23	23 40
8. Evaluation of teachers	A			67		33			33	33
	T	47	26				26		53	16
	S	47	15					34	15	32
9. Evaluation of administrators	A	N/A				33			67	
	T	N/A					26		47	
	S	N/A							23	53

Table 35 (continued)

Decision Items* Group	% of Perceived Decision-Making							% of Preferred Decision-Making						
	Groups							Groups						
	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T	S		A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S
10.Attendance policy	A	33		67				33			67			
	T	53						42			53			
	S	54	43								32	38		
11.Late policy	A			67				33			67			
	T	21	47		26			42			47			
	S	28	36		19						32	30		
12.Student sus- pension	A							33			67			
	T							47			47			
	S										53	23		
13.Dismissal of a teacher	A						67	33						
	T							74			21			
	S							15	32		38			
15.Classroom standards	A							67			33			
	T							16			32	16	37	
	S										28	47		
16.Student Dress regulations	A			100							100			
	T	21	16	32				16			58			16
	S	38		21		21					28			57

Table 35 (continued)

Decision Items*Group	% of Perceived Decision-Making % of Preferred Decision-Making									
	Groups					Groups				
	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T S	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T S
17. Student Time-tables	A	T	S			67	33			
						42	26	21		
							21	45		
18. Expenditure of Student Union Funds	A	T	S			33	67			
						37	47			57
							30			
22. Selection of a staff	A	T	S			33	67			
						47	53			
						26		30	30	
28. Expenditure of School Board funds	A	T	S				100			
							63	26		
							15	66		
30. Student-choice of a teacher	A	T	S			67			33	
						21	26		16	21
						17		23	15	28

*Decision Items show a significant difference at $p < .05$
 Frequencies less than 15% are not recorded.

students and teachers perceived these items to be administrator-oriented.

When the decision-making sources are combined into the different decision-making orientations, six other less serious, decision-making differences (1, 4, 6, 20, 21 and 26) appeared between the three groups. These six decision items were perceived by the teachers and/or students as administrator-oriented, while the administrators perceived of them as having a lower decision-making orientation (Table 36).

The administrators at School C perceived of lower decision-making sources, than either the students or teachers, on some decision items.

Preferred Decision-Making Discrepancies of Groups within School C

Sixteen decision items (2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 22, 28 and 30) were preferred to have significantly different decision-making sources by the three groups at School C (Table 35). The administrators and teachers preferred decision items 12, 13, 17, 22, 28 and 30 to remain administrator-oriented but the students preferred these items to have a shared or lower decision-making source. Decision items 2, 10, 11 and 15 were preferred by the teachers and students to be teacher-oriented but the adminis-

Table 36

Categorization of the Percentage Frequencies of Each Group at School C
with regard to Their Decision-Making Orientations
on the Three Subscales
(N=69)

Decision Item	Group	Admin. Oriented		Teacher Oriented		Student Oriented		Shared	
		Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.
1.	A (n=3)			100	100				H
	T (n=19)			79	100				H
	S (n=47)	81			85				H
2.	A (n=3)	100	100			L			
	T (n=19)	100		100		H			
	S (n=47)	100		89		L			
3.	A (n=3)			100	100	L			
	T (n=19)			95	100	L			
	S (n=47)			96	89	L			
4.	A (n=3)							67	100
	T (n=19)	95							L
	S (n=47)					85	98	68	H
5.	A (n=3)			100					L
	T (n=19)			90	100				L
	S (n=47)			72			91		H

Table 36 (continued)

Decision Item	Group	Admin. Oriented		Teacher Oriented		Student Oriented		Shared	
		Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.
6.	A (n=3)							100	100
	T (n=19)	100						84	H
	S (n=47)	96						51	H
7.	A (n=3)			100	100				H
	T (n=19)			95	100				H
	S (n=47)			90	98				H
8.	A (n=3)		67					67	H
	T (n=19)	74							H
	S (n=47)	70				94		53	H
9.	A (n=3)	N/A						67	H
	T (n=19)	N/A			95				H
	S (n=47)	N/A				94			H
10.	A (n=3)								
	T (n=19)	100						67	L
	S (n=47)	81			87			53	L
11.	A (n=3)								
	T (n=19)			74				67	L
	S (n=47)	68		83	83			50	L

Table 36 (continued)

Decision Item	Group	Admin.Oriented		Teacher Oriented		Student Oriented		Shared	
		Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.
12.	A (n=3)	100					L		67
	T (n=19)	100	100				L		
	S (n=47)	96					H		53
13.	A (n=3)	67	100		H				
	T (n=19)	84	100		L				
	S (n=47)	87	96		L				
14.	A (n=3)	100							
	T (n=19)	95		100	H				
	S (n=47)	91		100	H				
15.	A (n=3)								
	T (n=19)			100	L				
	S (n=47)			83	L				
16.	A (n=3)								
	T (n=19)	68						100	100
	S (n=47)	74				96		58	L
17.	A (n=3)	100	100		H				
	T (n=19)	100	100		L				
	S (n=47)	94			H	87			

Table 36 (continued)

Decision Item Group	Admin. Oriented		Teacher Oriented		Student Oriented		Shared	
	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.
18.	A(n=3)							
	T(n=19)		95		L		67	67
	S(n=47)				L			
19.	A(n=3)	100				98		
	T(n=19)	100						
	S(n=47)	91			H			
20.	A(n=3)		100					
	T(n=19)	95		H				
	S(n=47)	72		H				
21.	A(n=3)							
	T(n=19)							
	S(n=47)	89		L				
22.	A(n=3)	100					100	100
	T(n=19)	85					53	58
	S(n=47)	79						53
23.	A(n=3)	N/A						
	T(n=19)	N/A			L			67
	S(n=47)	N/A			L			

Table 36 (continued)

Decision Item	Group	Admin. Oriented		Teacher Oriented		Student Oriented		Shared	
		Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.
24.	A (n=3)	N/A		100	L				
	T (n=19)	N/A		100	L				
	S (n=47)	N/A		85	L				
25.	A (n=3)	33						67	H
	T (n=19)	79						63	L
	S (n=47)	85						68	H
26.	A (n=3)							67	H
	T (n=19)	79						68	H
	S (n=47)	62						64	L
27.	A (n=3)	67				67	L		
	T (n=19)	68					L	63	
	S (n=47)					64	95		
28.	A (n=3)	100							
	T (n=19)	84	100						H
	S (n=47)	79	95						H
29.	A (n=3)	N/A	100					66	H
	T (n=19)	N/A	89						
	S (n=47)	N/A	75						

Table 36 (continued)

Decision Item	Group	<u>Admin. Oriented</u>		<u>Teacher Oriented</u>		<u>Student Oriented</u>		<u>Shared</u>	
		Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.	Perc.	Pref. Int.
30.	A (n=3)	100	100						H
	T (n=19)	52	74						H
	S (n=47)	76				79			H

trators wanted them more administrator-oriented. Teachers and/or administrators preferred shared decision-making for items 4, 5, 8, 9, 16 and 18 but the students preferred these items to be more student-oriented (Table 35). These decision-making discrepancies between the three groups at School C were substantiated by the different preferred decision-making orientations outlined in Table 36.

The administrators at School C preferred involvement in almost all decision-making, while the students and teachers preferred more teacher-student (T-S) or shared decision-making.

Intended Decision-Making Discrepancies of Groups within School C

At School C, teachers expressed high commitment toward twelve decision items (1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 20, 26, 28 and 30) on the Intended Decision-Making Subscale (Table 36). Students were highly committed to sixteen items (1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 17, 18, 22, 23, 25, 28, 29 and 30) at School C (Table 36). Eight of these decision items (1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 28 and 30) had mutually high commitments from both member groups. There were eight decision items (3, 10, 11, 16, 19, 21, 24 and 27) that no group, at School C, appeared to be highly committed toward.

At School C, students appeared to be quite concerned about, (1) attaining more decision-making autonomy (Item 13), (2) being involved in evaluation of the administration and staff (Items 8, 9, 22, 29 and 30) and (3) having greater control of some of the student-oriented and shared decision items (4, 5, 6, 12, 17, 18 and 25). Students at School C were willing to commit more time to a greater variety of decision items, than students at either School B or A (Table 23).

At School C, teachers did not appear to exhibit the increased amount of commitment that may be required of them, if their preferred decision-making sources are implemented. The teachers had similar commitments to teachers of Schools A and B but they were willing to commit less time to a smaller variety of decision items, than teachers from the other schools (Table 23).

The analysis of the intended decision-making subscale seems to indicate that teachers at School C are not committed to changing the present decision-making orientations but the students are more committed, than students at the other two schools. The most contentious decision items, on the three decision-making subscales, at School C, appeared to be Items 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 30.

Satisfaction Discrepancies of Groups within School C

Less than 50% of the students at School C were satisfied with the school climate. This may have marked implications for the schools' decision-making (Clarke, 1970). The teachers, at School C, were satisfied but the students expressed significantly lower satisfaction levels with regard to teacher relations, administrator relations, work progress and school climate (Table 37).

The lower satisfaction, high commitment and preferred decentralization of decision-making exhibited by students at School C seemed to imply that the students, at School C, were demanding more authentic participation in the decision-making processes of their school.

SUMMARY

The inter-school and intra-school comparisons identified different decision-making orientations at different schools. Member groups from different schools appeared to prefer lower decision-making sources for almost all items but they did not prefer the same decision-making sources on all decision items. Some member groups had different commitment and satisfaction levels in different schools. These mediating variables seemed to affect the decision-making orientations of each school differently.

Table 37

Percentage Frequencies and Mean Scores of Teachers
and Students from School C on the Satisfaction
Subscale
(N=66)

Satisfaction Items	Group	% of Satisfied Group	Mean Score	p
1. Relations with students	T	100	5.3	
	S	94	5.0	N.S.
2. Relations with teachers	T	95	4.8	
	S	72	4.1	S*
3. Relations with administrators	T	89	4.5	
	S	53	3.6	S*
4. Work progress	T	95	4.9	
	S	70	4.3	S*
5. School climate	T	84	4.5	
	S	34	3.3	S*
6. Self-image	T	100	4.8	
	S	87	4.4	N.S.

*Groups differ significantly from each other ($p < .05$)

School C was perceived as the most administrator-oriented, School B was perceived as the least administrator-oriented and School A was intermediate between the other two schools. All member groups preferred lower decision-making sources in their schools. Group members preferred the greatest decision-making shift in School C, then School B and the least decision-making shift was required of School A. The greatest degree of parallelism was exhibited between the preferred and perceived decision-making orientations of School A. However, the greatest degree of parallel decision-making on each decision-making subscale was exhibited by the member groups within School B. The satisfaction level of teachers at School B was slightly lower than teachers at the other two schools, while the students at School B exhibited the highest satisfaction levels. Students, at School C, were willing to devote the most time to the greatest variety of decision items, while students at School A were willing to commit the least amount of time to the smallest number of decision items. Teachers, at School B, were willing to commit more time to the greatest variety of decision items and teachers from School C were willing to commit the least time to the smallest number of decision items.

The decision-making patterns of each school were unique and it would require different decision-making transi-

tions for each school, if the decision-making orientations and priorities of each schools member groups are to become more compatible.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

SUMMARY

The Problem and Subproblems

The purpose of the study was to determine which modes of decision-making; unilateral, partially-shared, or shared are being used or could be implemented for various school issues. Specifically, the major problem was to determine the degree of authentic participation perceived, preferred and intended by administrators, teachers and student governments in the decision-making processes of their high schools. The following more specific subproblems were formulated:

(1) What decision-making sources do students, teachers and administrators perceive and prefer on school decision items?

(2) What differences exist between the decision-making orientations of the three groups, on the Perceived, Preferred and Intended Decision-Making Subscales?

(3) What decision-making conflicts can be observed from the perceived, preferred and intended decision-making

orientations of administrators, teachers and students?

(4) What relationship exists between the different decision-making orientations of the three groups and their satisfaction levels?

(5) What differences exist in the perceived, preferred and intended decision-making orientations in different schools?

(6) What relationship exists between different school decision-making orientations and member group satisfaction?

(7) What differences exist between the perceived, preferred and intended decision-making orientations of member groups within a school?

(8) What are some of the conflict decision items in a school?

Related Literature

In a review of the literature, no quantifiable findings were found that can be academically justified, supporting the superiority of shared decision-making over individual decision-making. This controversy no longer seems to be a question of academic debate. Shared decision-making is now being regarded as the inalienable right of those affected by a decision, where each group member holds each other accountable to the group decision.

In the present political setting, with increasing teacher and student militancy, most educators appear to believe that it is advisable to increase both student and teacher autonomy in school decision-making. It will probably be a key function of the principal to guide this new autonomy of each group into mutually amenable decision-making patterns, avoiding preferential group involvement and divergence of party groups. McGrath (1970:92) formulates a similar conclusion when he states:

The basic plank in the new academic political platform ought to be the idea that the dominant mission of the institution (school) is the advancement of education, not the enhancement and strengthening of party groups.

Because every individual has limited time commitments and personal priorities, it is fallacious to think that all individuals will have the same commitments and preferences in decision-making. The nature of the decision, the kind of institution and the types of member groups will demand different group combinations for decision-making. Shared decision-making, involving all member groups, should not be considered as the panacea to all decision items. Those decision items, which exhibit a high concern and commitment of all member groups, are probably most conducive to shared decision-making.

Research Design

To give a comprehensive picture of the unilateral, partially-shared and shared decision-making patterns in high school, it was necessary to include all member groups (administrators, teachers and students) most intimately affected by school decisions. The instruments of former decision-making studies, which had the Perceived and Preferred Decision-Making Subscales, were extended to include a third decision-making subscale, the Intended Subscale. The purpose of this subscale was to ascertain which member groups would be most willing to participate in various decision items, in addition to their present work commitments. Included in the questionnaire, besides the three decision-making subscales, was a Satisfaction Subscale and a personal information section, to describe the sample. This questionnaire, including thirty decision items on the three decision-making subscales, was distributed to the sample population to determine the decision-making orientations of different groups and schools.

The different decision items were categorized into four possible decision-making orientations: (1) administrator-oriented items, which included a maximum of the A, A-T, A-S and A-T-S responses, (2) teacher-oriented items, which included a maximum of the A-T, A-T-S, T-S and T

responses, (3) student-oriented items, which included a maximum of the A-S, A-T-S, T-S and S responses, (4) shared-oriented items, which included over 50% for the A-T-S responses. A sample of equal staff and student representation was used to determine the perceived and preferred decision-making orientations, thereby, eliminating any preferential group bias.

After determining the perceived and preferred decision-making orientations of the sample using the equal weighting of one staff member per student, an inter-group comparison was made to locate any significant differences in their perceived, preferred and intended decision-making orientations. Possible relationships between the satisfaction levels of different groups and their decision-making discrepancies were also examined.

An inter-school comparison was made, using twice as many staff members as students in the sample to determine the decision-making orientations of each school. Then, identical member groups, in different schools, were compared on the Satisfaction and Decision-Making Subscales to determine plausible reasons for the decision-making orientations of each school.

Finally, an intra-school analysis was made of each school, comparing the perceived, preferred, and intended

decision-making discrepancies between different groups, within the schools, arising from the non-contiguous nature of the perceived and preferred decision-making orientations of each school. Different member groups in each school were compared on the Satisfaction Subscale, with possible relationships between the decision-making subscales being noted.

Findings

Subproblem 1. All three groups perceived most decision items to be administrator-oriented but preferred fewer decision items to be administrator-oriented. The three groups taken as a whole preferred most of the decision items to be teacher-oriented or lower.

Subproblem 2. Numerous perceived and preferred decision-making discrepancies (Appendix B) were noted between the three groups but only the more prominent decision-making differences were retained when the decision-making sources of each item were condensed into the different decision-making orientations. There were a negligible number of decision items that the three groups perceived as having different decision-making orientations. Approximately one-half of the decision items were preferred by the three groups to have different decision-making orientations.

The most significant difference between the three

groups occurred on the Intended Decision-Making Subscale. The students expressed a higher commitment for all decision items.

Subproblem 3. Those decision items for which the member groups expressed high commitment and marked decision-making discrepancies either within or between the perceived and preferred decision-making subscales appeared to identify the most troublesome conflict items between the three groups.

Subproblem 4. Students were the least satisfied of the three groups. This low satisfaction of the students, with the school situation, could infer a dissatisfaction with the present decision-making processes in the high school (Clarke, 1970) and a high drive for involvement in some of the more relevant decision items.

Subproblem 5. There were different decision-making sources perceived and preferred in different schools. School A exhibited the least difference between its perceived and preferred decision-making orientations. Member groups at School B perceived and preferred the greatest amount of shared decision-making, while member groups at School C preferred the greatest number of decision-making shifts from the higher decision sources (administrator or administrator-teacher) to the lower decision-making sources.

On the Intended Decision-Making Subscale, there was

no appreciable difference in the amount of time teachers, of different schools, were willing to commit to different decision items, but the teachers at School B were willing to commit themselves to the greatest variety of items and teachers at School C appeared committed to the least variety of decision items. Students at School A had the lowest commitment level to various decision items, while students at School C were willing to commit more time to the greatest variety of decision items. There were more decision items of mutual commitment by the three member groups at School B, than either of the other schools.

Subproblem 6. The satisfaction with the school situation varied between schools. Teachers at School B were less satisfied than teachers at School A or School C but the students at School B were more satisfied than the students at either of the other schools.

Subproblem 7. Multiple decision-making differences existed between the member groups within a school. Students and teachers at School A preferred more decision-making autonomy but the students did not indicate the necessary commitment required to attain increased involvement in decision-making.

Students and teachers at School B appeared to have attained more decision-making autonomy than member groups

at other schools but the heavy burden of trying to share the decision-making process may be responsible for the slightly lower teacher morale at School B. The mutually high commitment of member groups, at School B, to similar decision items, might indicate that each group is trying to hold the other accountable in some form of collegial decision-making.

At School C, the students appeared to be exerting a greater thrust for authentic involvement in the decision-making process, than students at either of the other schools. Both students and teachers preferred lower decision-making sources on a greater variety of decision items, than either School A or School B members.

Subproblem 8. Each school appears to have some conflict items which are common to other schools, but other conflict items that are the special concern of each school would seem to dictate different decision-making transitions for each school, in accordance with the mutual priorities and preferences of each schools' member groups.

CONCLUSIONS

Perceived and Preferred Decision-Making Sources

When students were introduced as viable members of possible decision-making groups, involving teachers and administrators, many decision items were both perceived

and preferred at a lower decision-making source, than many previous studies have intimated. This is particularly true for those decision items which affected the student or all three member groups in the school. Either administrators are being politically astute in co-opting the staff and students or they feel that the group pressures are forcing them to select more amenable shared and partially shared decision-making positions in the political climates of their schools. High intended decision-making orientations and low satisfaction of the students, coupled with the cohesive decision-making preferences of the staff, would seem to indicate that the latter conclusion is more accurate. It appears that the more decision-making authority a group has, the more it considers itself democratic and sharing in the decision-making process, when all three member groups are involved. There was a high preference indicated by all groups on almost all decision items for the shared (A-T-S) or partially shared (A-T, T-S or A-S) decision-making sources. The self-interests of each group appear to be somewhat mitigated when all three member groups are involved in the decision-making process.

Intended Decision-Making Commitments

The most striking conclusion arrived at from the Intended Decision-Making Subscale was the high commitment

expressed by the students, on almost all decision items, to change the perceived higher decision-making sources to lower decision sources. Lower decision-making sources were preferred by the teachers but they were not willing to commit the substantial amount of time that would be required to substantiate their preferred demands for autonomy in the decision-making process. This observation tends to support the findings of Fawley (1967:349), who observed that teachers desired negligible increases in decision-making authority. However, the high commitments and pointed decision-making preferences (Item 8) of the students may force the teachers to become more accountable and responsible for the decision-making processes of their schools.

Satisfaction Levels

It appears that students are the least satisfied group members in most schools. However, satisfaction levels of identical groups in different schools and satisfaction levels of different groups within the same school seem to vary significantly with the school situation. Member groups in the school with the lowest perceived and preferred decision-making sources had the highest average satisfaction score. Member groups in the school with the highest number of administrator-oriented decision items had the lowest average satisfaction level.

Critical Issues of School Administration

The most critical issues of school administration confronting the three member groups appeared to be the instructional program, the extra-curricular program and school-wide rules and regulations. The instructional program included those decision items dealing with curriculum, teaching competence and student-choice of teachers and courses. The extra-curricular program and selection of student supervisors appeared to be issues of growing concern in most high schools. School rules and regulations, attendance policies, late policies and school drug policies were also contentious issues to school member groups. Most schools appear to exhibit either latent or felt conflict on most of these issues between the different member groups. Those decision items, where member groups neglect particular functions or inadequately perform their functions for the mutual benefit of all member groups, appear to be the most critical conflict items.

Participatory Groups in Decision-Making

Almost all member groups prefer mutual involvement (shared decision-making) in the critical issues of school administration; instructional program, extra-curricular program and school-wide rules and regulations. Decision items which appear to be of a vital concern to the adminis-

trator-teacher (A-T) decision-making groups are: Student suspension, parental contact, organization of staff meetings, subjects allotted to a teacher and parental influence in the school. Students appear to be seeking control of decision items governing: student activities, student dress, expenditure of Student Union funds and the evaluation of the Students' Union Advisor. The teachers appear to be the predominant decision-making group regarding decision items within the classroom. Not all member groups want to participate in the same decision items to the same extent. It would appear that administrators may have to redefine some of the unilateral, partially-shared and shared decision items, if overt conflict is to be avoided on some of the decision items. Shared decision-making should be used on some of the more critical school issues, affecting all member groups, but it should not provide a basis for intense personal conflict that is characterized by intimate relations of individual involvement in some organizational activities (Coser, 1956).

Decision-Making Discrepancies between Schools

Decision-making patterns of each school are unique and it will require different decision-making transitions for each school, if the decision-making orientations and priorities of each schools member groups are to become



more compatible. A variety of different decision-making preferences, high commitment and low satisfaction of a member group appear to be the strongest three indicators for decision-making change. School administrators should be cognizant of member groups with the above three traits, if appropriate decision-making transitions are to be enacted. Shared decision-making should not be treated as the panacea for all conflict decision items. Shared decision-making may appear to be more amenable to all groups but teachers at one school, who perceived and preferred more shared decision-making, found it very demanding.

IMPLICATIONS

Some of the more important implications of this study appear to be:

First, one of the key functions of senior high school administrators will be to prevent the divergence of member groups in the schools by encouraging shared decision-making in those areas of high mutual concern and selective group involvement in areas of high concern to a particular group. Both students and teachers prefer increased decision-making autonomy, but one should not be attained at the expense of the other.

Second, the acquired political finesse, high commit-

ment and low satisfaction of the student member group makes them the most threatening power group within the school system. Administrators may have to treat the student as a constituent, representing the community and deserving certain civil rights, rather than a client aided and abetted by the "in loco parentis" principle. If educators can attain the allegiance of the student group and their identification with school objectives then the community-school rift may become a less contentious issue and the hierarchial "buck-passing" may become more accountable to the member group the schools were created for.

A third implication is that decision items affecting all three member groups should be carefully scrutinized and mutually formulated by all member groups. The extra-curricular program, student supervisors, student-body regulations, evaluation of teachers and administrators, attendance policies, student timetables and expenditure of School Board funds are decision items which showed a marked concern and conflict between different member groups. Parental influence and contact appear to be a major issue for both administrators and teachers. There were other decision items which were the unilateral concern of either the students (student dress regulations, expenditure of Student Union funds, Student Cabinet, and evaluation of the

Student Union Advisor) or teachers (decisions within the classroom). Consequently, administrators may have to re-define the areas of unilateral, partially shared, and shared decision-making, thereby, clarifying in their own minds what is really important.

Finally, because decision-making policies are relevant and temporal, each administrator should frequently assess the degree of authentic participation desired by member groups in the schools' decision-making processes. Surveys, using similar research techniques might be employed by administrators to attain the necessary information.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

A replication of this study, using the same groups but involving more schools, may be required to provide adequate evidence in relation to the problems investigated. To attain composite and more authentic decision-making patterns, within schools, it is advisable to involve all member groups in the school and retain the Intended Decision-Making Subscale of the instrument. Further revisions and development of the Shared Decision-Making Questionnaire should be included as an integral part of such studies.

A second area of research may be to examine the

motives behind the decision-making preferences of different member groups. Such a study could require personal interviews for the collection of data.

Lastly, a study which examines the decision-making orientations of groups external to the school (parents and central office personnel) may relate some interesting implications to high school decision-making.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Ackerley, Robert L.
 1971 "Reactions to the Reasonable Exercise of Authority." The National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, Vol. 55, No. 32, Feb.: 1-9.
- Allport, F.
 1920 "The Influence of the Group Upon Association and Thought." Journal of Experimental Psychology, Vol. 3:152-182.
- Allport, Gordon W.
 1954 "The Historical Background of Social Psychology." Handbook of Social Psychology, edited by Gardner Lindzey. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley, Vol. 1:45.
- Argyris, Chris
 1957 Personality and Organization. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Blau, P.M. and R.W. Scott
 1962 Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.
- Blumberg, Arthur, William Wayson and Wilford Weber
 1969 "Elementary School Cabinet." Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 5, No. 3, Fall: 39-52.
- Bridges, E.M.
 1964 "Teacher Participation in Decision-Making." Administrator's Notebook, Vol. 12, No. 9, May.
- Bridges, E.M.
 1967 "A Model for Shared Decision-Making in the School Principalship." Educational Administrative Quarterly, Vol. 3, No. 1, Winter:49.
- Bridges, E.M., W.F. Doyle and D.J. Mahan
 1968 "Effects of Hierarchical Differentiation on Group Productivity, Efficiency, and Risk-taking." Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 13, No. 2, September:305-319.

- Bridges, E.M.
 1970 "Administrative Man: Origin or Pawn in Decision-Making?" Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 6, No. 1, Winter:7-25.
- Campbell, R.F., J.E. Corbally and J.A. Ramseyer
 1962 Introduction to Educational Administration (2nd edition). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Chesler, Mark
 1970 "Shared Power and Student Decision-Making." Educational Leadership, Oct.:9-14.
- Clarke, G.A.
 1970 "Teachers' Perceptions of School Decision-Making Roles." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta.
- Collins, B.E., and H. Guetzkow
 1964 A Social Psychology of Group Processes for Decision-Making. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Corwin, R.G.
 1965 A Sociology of Education. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.
- Coser, Lewis
 1956 The Functions of Social Conflict. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.
- Dashiell, J.T.
 1935 "Experimental Studies in the Influence of Social Situations on the Behavior of Individual Human Adults," in C. Murchison (ed.). A Handbook of Social Psychology, Worcester, Mass.: Clark University Press.
- Fawley, R.M.
 1967 "Teacher Freedom to Make Institutional Decisions and Its Relation to Classroom Techniques and Staff Morale." Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 27:349.
- Ferguson, George A.
 1966 Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- Friesen, D.
 1967 "Students and School Organization." Alberta Principals' Leadership Course. pp. 59-67.

Gorton, Richard A.

- 1970 "Principals' Orientation Toward Participation In School Decision-Making." Journal of Secondary Education, Vol. 45, No. 3, March:125-129.

Griffiths, Daniel E.

- 1959 Administrative Theory. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.

Halpin, A.W. and Croft, D.B.

- 1963 The Organizational Climate of Schools. Chicago: Midwest Administration Centre, University of Chicago.

Halpin, Andrew W.

- 1958 Administrative Theory in Education. New York: The MacMillan Company.

Havighurst Committee

- 1970 "A Profile of the Large City High School." The National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Committee Paper Number Three, Nov.

Hawley, G.B.

- 1969 "Actual and Preferred Levels of Curriculum Decision-Making as Perceived by Selected Groups." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta.

Hemphill, J.K. and A.E. Coons

- 1957 "Development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire." Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, R.M. Stogdill and A.E. Coons, editors. Columbia Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University.

Hodgkinson, Harold

- 1969 "Science" vs. "Soul": A.A.H.E. Conference. Canadian University, Vol. 4, No. 3:41-42.

Hodgkinson, Harold

- 1970 "Student Protest: An Institutional and National Profile." The Record, Teachers College, Columbia University, Vol. 21, No. 4, May:541-550.

Horst, Paul

- 1966 Psychological Measurement and Prediction. Belmont, California: Wadsworth.

- Knill, W.D.
 1967 "Community Decision-Making in the Educational Area." The Canadian Administrator, Vol. 6, No. 5, Feb:20.
- Kowalski, A. and W.D. Knill
 1966 "Teachers and Educational Decision-Making." The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, Vol.12 , No. 2:105.
- Kratzman, Arthur
 1970 "Teacher Power." The Ontario Secondary School Teachers Federation Bulletin, Vol. 50, No. 2, M:125-130.
- Lorge, I., D. Fox, J. Davitz and M. Brenner
 1958 "A Survey of Studies Contrasting the Quality of Group Performance and Individual Performance, 1920 - 1957." Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 55: 337-370.
- MacKinnon, Frank
 1970 "Administration, teaching and protest." The Ontario Secondary School Teachers Federation Bulletin, Vol. 50, No. 3, May:157-162.
- McGrath, Earl J.
 1970 Should Students Share the Power. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- McKenna, Bernard
 1971 "Student Unrest: Some Causes and Cures." The National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, Vol. 55, No. 32, Feb.:54-60.
- Milton, G.A.
 1965 "Group vs. Individual Problem Solving and Decision-Making." Canadian Public Administration, September: 301.
- Oliva, Frank D.
 1968 "Member Participation in Decision-Making." Canadian School Administrator Bulletin, Vol. 8, Feb.:22-55.
- Osborn, A.F.
 1957 Applied Imagination (revised edition). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Pondy, Louis R.

- 1967 "Organizational Conflict: Concept and Models." Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 12, No. 2, September:296-320.

Ratsoy, E.

- 1968 "Decision-Making: Must It Be A Cooperative Activity?" Alberta Principal's Leadership Course, pp. 9-16.

Riecken, H.W.

- 1958 "The Effect of Talkativeness on Ability to Influence Group Solutions of Problems", Sociometry, Vol. 21:309-321.

Schmuck, Richard and Arthur Blumberg

- 1969 "Teacher Participation in Organizational Decisions." National Association of Secondary Principals' Bulletin, Vol. 53, Oct.:19-105.

Shaw, M.E.

- 1932 "A Comparison of Individuals and Small Groups in the Rational Solution of Complex Problems." American Journal of Psychology, Vol. 44:491-504.

Siegel, Sidney

- 1956 Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

Simpkins, W.S.

- 1968 "The Distribution of Decision-Making Authority in the School." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alberta.

Strauss, George

- 1963 "Some Notes of Power-Equalization." The Social Science of Organizations, edited by Harold J. Leavitt. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.: 62.

Taylor, D.W., P.C. Berry and C.H. Block

- 1958 "Group Participation, Brainstorming and Creative Thinking." Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 3:23-47.

Triezenberg, George

- 1971 "How to live with due Process." The National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, Vol. 55, No. 32, Feb.:61-68.

Vars, G.F.

- 1968 "The Administrator: Teacher or Teachers." Illinois Schools Journal, Vol. 48, Fall:165-175.

Willis, H.L.

- 1968 "Student Power - Are We Ready to Use It." Ontario Secondary School Teachers Federation Bulletin, Vol. 48, No. 6, Dec.:483-485.

Willower, Donald J.

- 1965 "Hypotheses on the School as a Social System." Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 1, Aug.:40-50.

APPENDIX A

SHARED DECISION-MAKING QUESTIONNAIRE

SHARED DECISION-MAKING QUESTIONNAIRE

The items in this questionnaire are concerned with general school issues and procedures. The study is designed to investigate the degree of authentic participation that teachers, student governments and administrators desire in the decision-making processes of their school.

It is most important that each respondent reply to the items in a frank and honest manner. Please do not discuss your replies with other school personnel, because each answer should be attained in an independent fashion, from your own personal experiences.

Do not write your name on the questionnaire, because all replies will be treated as strictly confidential.

Please respond to all items.

DIRECTIONS

(a) Read the examples and explanations of each section carefully.

(b) Read each item carefully.

(c) Think about how each item applies to you in your school.

(d) Respond to each item in the manner indicated in each section.

(e) If you wish to change an answer, cross it out and circle your new response.

SECTION I

PERSONAL INFORMATION

DIRECTIONS: Circle the letter of the most appropriate response.

1. Sex: A. Male
 B. Female

2. Age category, as of your last birthday:

 A. 14-21
 B. 22-29
 C. 30-37
 D. 38-45
 E. 46-53
 F. 54 or over.

3. Marital Status:

 A. Single
 B. Married
 C. Divorced
 D. Widow or Widower

4. Number of hours per week you spend on your present work commitments. (This includes work time spent at the school, homework, class preparation, school activities, outside jobs, etc.)

 A. 20 - 26 hrs. per week
 B. 27 - 33 hrs. per week
 C. 34 - 40 hrs. per week
 D. 41 - 47 hrs. per week
 E. 48 - 54 hrs. per week
 F. 55 - 61 hrs. per week
 G. 62 or more hrs. per week

5. What is your total number of years of formal education (elementary, junior-high, senior-high, university, and NAIT)?

 A. 10 - 12 years
 B. 13 - 15 years
 C. 16 - 18 years
 D. 19 - 21 years
 E. 22 or more years

SECTION II

SATISFACTION

DIRECTIONS: Rate your degree of satisfaction on each of the following items. Circle the letter which best describes your feelings.

- A) Highly satisfied
- B) Quite satisfied
- C) Slightly satisfied
- D) Slightly dissatisfied
- E) Quite dissatisfied
- F) Highly dissatisfied

1)	Relations with students in your school	A	B	C	D	E	F
2)	Relations with teachers in your school	A	B	C	D	E	F
3)	Relations with administrators in your school	A	B	C	D	E	F
4)	Your progress in your work and school activities	A	B	C	D	E	F
5)	Present school climate	A	B	C	D	E	F
6)	Assessment of your personal or self-image	A	B	C	D	E	F

SECTION III

PERCEIVED DECISION-MAKING

This section is concerned with the amount of actual or perceived decision-making, that you feel is utilized at your school.

Each item is followed by the following possible responses:

- A - the administrator (principal or vice-principal) usually makes the decision.
- A-T - the administrator and teacher collectively make the decision.
- A-S - the administrator and student collectively make the decision.
- A-T-S - the administrator, teacher, and student collectively make the decision.
- T-S - the teacher and student collectively make the decision.
- T - the teacher makes the decision.
- S - the student makes the decision.
- N/A - indicates the item is not applicable to your school or you do not have sufficient knowledge to pass judgment on the item.

DIRECTIONS: Circle the most appropriate response to the following question, concerning the issues or items listed.

QUESTION: WHO DOES PARTICIPATE IN DECISION-MAKING REGARDING THE FOLLOWING ITEMS:

Example Item X:

Formulation of indolent- A A-T A-S A-T-S T-S T S N/A
student policy

Explanation:

The A-T-S response indicates that the administrators, students, and teachers collectively participate in formulating the indolent-student policy.

WHO DOES PARTICIPATE IN DECISION-MAKING REGARDING THE FOLLOW-
ING ITEMS:

1)	Extent of knowledge to be taught or covered in an academic year	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
2)	Determination of class size	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
3)	Frequency of home-work assignments	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
4)	The type and number of extra-curricular activities (sports, clubs, social activities).	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
5)	Selection of supervisors for student activities	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
6)	Rules and regulations at student activities	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
7)	Evaluation of pupil-progress	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
8)	Evaluation of teacher-effectiveness	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
9)	Evaluation of administrator-effectiveness	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
10)	Student attendance-policy	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
11)	Student late-policy	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
12)	Student suspension from school	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A

WHO DOES PARTICIPATE IN DECISION-MAKING REGARDING THE FOLLOW-
ING ITEMS:

13)	Dismissal or transfer of a teacher from a school	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
14)	Contact of a parent concerning student discipline or attendance	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
15)	Standards of classroom behavior	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
16)	Standards of student dress and appearance	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
17)	Formulation of student timetables	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
18)	Expenditure of students' union funds	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
19)	Agenda and frequency of staff meetings	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
20)	The selection of subjects a teacher is best qualified to teach	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
21)	Allocation of student awards	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
22)	Selection of staff (teachers) for a school	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
23)	Formulation of a student committee to meet with the superintendent or school board	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A

WHO DOES PARTICIPATE IN DECISION-MAKING REGARDING THE FOLLOW-
ING ITEMS:

24)	Formulation of a staff committee to meet with the superintendent or school board	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
25)	Formulation of a school drug policy	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
26)	Degree of parental or community influence in the school	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
27)	Evaluation of the effectiveness of the students' union advisor	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
28)	Expenditure of funds allotted to the school by the school board	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
29)	Selection of a principal for a school	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
30)	The selection of a teacher a student should have for various courses	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A

SECTION IV

PREFERRED DECISION-MAKING

This section is concerned with the amount of decision-making you would prefer to exhibit at your school.

Each item is followed by the following responses:

- A - the administrator (vice-principal or principal) should make the decision.
- A-T - the administrator and teacher should collectively make the decision.
- A-S - the administrator and student should collectively make the decision.
- A-T-S - the administrator, student, and teacher should collectively make the decision.
- T-S - the teacher and student should collectively make the decision.
- T - the teacher should make the decision.
- S - the student should make the decision.

DIRECTIONS: Circle the most appropriate response to the following question, concerning the issues or items listed.

QUESTION: WHO SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN DECISION-MAKING REGARDING THE FOLLOWING ITEMS:

Example Item X:

Formulation of indolent- A A-T (A-S) A-T-S T-S T S
student policy

Explanation:

The A-S response indicates that the administrators and students should collectively participate in formulating the indolent-student policy.

WHO SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN DECISION-MAKING REGARDING THE FOLLOW-
ING ITEMS:

1)	Extent of knowledge to be taught or covered in an academic year	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
2)	Determination of class size	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
3)	Frequency of home-work assignments	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
4)	The type and number of extra-curricular activities (sports, clubs, social activities).	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
5)	Selection of supervisors for student activities	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
6)	Rules and regulations at student activities	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
7)	Evaluation of pupil-progress	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
8)	Evaluation of teacher-effectiveness	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
9)	Evaluation of administrator-effectiveness	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
10)	Student attendance-policy	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
11)	Student late-policy	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
12)	Student suspension from school	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A

WHO SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN DECISION-MAKING REGARDING THE FOLLOW-
ING ITEMS:

13)	Dismissal or transfer of a teacher from a school	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
14)	Contact of a parent concerning student discipline or attendance	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
15)	Standards of classroom behavior	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
16)	Standards of student dress and appearance	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
17)	Formulation of student timetables	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
18)	Expenditure of students' union funds	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
19)	Agenda and frequency of staff meetings	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
20)	The selection of subjects a teacher is best qualified to teach	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
21)	Allocation of student awards	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
22)	Selection of staff (teachers) for a school	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
23)	Formulation of a student committee to meet with the superintendent or school board	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A

WHO SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN DECISION-MAKING REGARDING THE FOLLOW-
ING ITEMS:

24)	Formulation of a staff committee to meet with the superintendent or school board	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
25)	Formulation of a school drug policy	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
26)	Degree of parental or community influence in the school	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
27)	Evaluation of the effectiveness of the students' union advisor	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
28)	Expenditure of funds allotted to the school by the school board	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
29)	Selection of a principal for a school	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A
30)	The selection of a teacher a student should have for various courses	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S	N/A

Explanation:

The 1 hour per week response, indicates that you would be willing to spend one hour per week, for the remainder of the school term, formulating the indolent-student policy.

HOW MUCH TIME PER WEEK, IN ADDITION TO YOUR PRESENT WORK COMMITMENTS (work time spent at the school, homework, class preparation, school activities, outside jobs, etc.) WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO SPEND PARTICIPATING IN DECISIONS REGARDING THE FOLLOWING ITEMS. If the item is already a part of your regular duties, indicate 0 hrs.

	0 hrs.	1/2 hrs.	1 hr.	1 1/2 hrs.	2 hrs.	2 1/2 hrs.
1) Extent of knowledge to be taught or covered in an academic year	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
2) Determination of class size	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
3) Frequency of homework assignments	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
4) The type and number of extra-curricular activities (sports, clubs, social activities).	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
5) Selection of supervisors for student activities	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
6) Rules and regulations at student activities	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
7) Evaluation of pupil-progress	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
8) Evaluation of teacher-effectiveness	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
9) Evaluation of administrator-effectiveness	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
10) Student attendance-policy	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2

HOW MUCH TIME PER WEEK, IN ADDITION TO YOUR PRESENT WORK COMMITMENTS (work time spent at the school, homework, class preparation, school activities, outside jobs, etc.) WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO SPEND PARTICIPATING IN DECISIONS REGARDING THE FOLLOWING ITEMS. If the item is already a part of your regular duties, indicate 0 hrs.

	0 hrs.	1/2 hrs.	1 hr.	1 1/2 hrs.	2 hrs.	2 1/2 hrs.
11) Student late-policy	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
12) Student suspension from school	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
13) Dismissal or trans- fer of a teacher from a school	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
14) Contact of a parent concerning student discipline or atten- dance	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
15) Standards of class- room behavior	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
16) Standards of student dress and appearance	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
17) Formulation of stu- dent timetables	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
18) Expenditure of stu- dents' union funds	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
19) Agenda and frequency of staff meetings	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
20) The selection of subjects a teacher is best qualified to teach	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
21) Allocation of stu- dent awards	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2

HOW MUCH TIME PER WEEK, IN ADDITION TO YOUR PRESENT WORK COMMITMENTS (work time spent at the school, homework, class preparation, school activities, outside jobs, etc.) WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO SPEND PARTICIPATING IN DECISIONS REGARDING THE FOLLOWING ITEMS. If the time is already a part of your regular duties, indicate 0 hrs.

	0 hrs.	1/2 hr.	1 hr.	1 1/2 hrs.	2 hrs.	2 1/2 hrs.
22) Selection of staff (teachers) for a school	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
23) Formulation of a student committee to meet with the superintendent or school board	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
24) Formulation of a staff committee to meet with the superintendent or school board	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
25) Formulation of a school drug policy	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
26) Degree of parental or community influence in the school	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
27) Evaluation of the effectiveness of the students' union advisor	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
28) Expenditure of funds allotted to the school by the school board	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
29) Selection of a principal for a school	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2

HOW MUCH TIME PER WEEK, IN ADDITION TO YOUR PRESENT WORK COMMITMENTS (work time spent at the school, homework, class preparation, school activities, outside jobs, etc.) WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO SPEND PARTICIPATING IN DECISIONS REGARDING THE FOLLOWING ITEMS. If the time is already a part of your regular duties, indicate 0 hrs.

	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
	hrs.	hr.	hr.	hrs.	hrs.	hrs.

30) The selection of a teacher a student should have for various courses	0	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	2 1/2
--	---	-----	---	-------	---	-------

"THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION"

APPENDIX B

Percentage Frequencies of the Perceived
and Preferred Decision-Making Sources
of Administrators, Teachers and
Students

Table 38

Percentage Distributions of Administrators
Teachers and Students on the Perceived Sub-
scale
(N=168)

Decision Items	% of Chosen Decision-Making Group					
	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T S
1. Extent of knowledge to be taught						
Admin.		44				33
Teachers		26			18	35
Students	17	47		17		
2. Class size						
Admin.	22	77				
Teachers	61	35				
Students	47	40				
3. Homework frequency						
Admin.						78
Teachers					29	61
Students					29	57
4. Extra-curricular program						
Admin.	22			44		33
Teachers				49		
Students				55		
5. Selection of supervisors for student activities						
Admin.	44			33	22	
Teachers	26			37	16	
Students	21			27	25	
6. Student body regulations						
Admin.				78	22	
Teachers		15		61		
Students	18	31		36		

Table 38 (continued)

Decision Items	% of Chosen Decision-Making Group						
	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S
7. Evaluation of students							
Admin.	22				22	44	
Teachers	28					51	
Students	38					39	
8. Evaluation of teachers							
Admin.		67		22			
Teachers	26	37					
Students	43						
10. Attendance policy							
Admin.		44		33			
Teachers	16	61					
Students	22	52					
11. Late policy							
Admin.		33		22	22		
Teachers		38				37	
Students	20	42				17	
12. Student suspension							
Admin.		67		22			
Teachers	37	48					
Students	36	38		20			
13. Dismissal of a teacher							
Admin.		67					
Teachers	39	21					
Students	47						
14. Parental contact concerning student							
Admin.		78					
Teachers	20	63					
Students		65					

Table 38 (continued)

Decision Items	% of Chosen Decision-Making Group						
	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S
15. Classroom standards							
Admin.					44	33	
Teachers		18			22	46	
Students		18			31	30	
16. Student dress regulations							
Admin.				33			33
Teachers				27			16
Students	27			27			29
17. Student timetables							
Admin.	33	33		33			
Teachers	46		23	16			
Students	42	20	17				
18. Expenditure of Student Union funds							
Admin.				33	22		33
Teachers			21	37			15
Students			16	22			38
19. Organization of staff meetings							
Admin.	22	44					
Teachers	40	52					
Students	31	39					
20. Subjects allotted to a teacher							
Admin.		100					
Teachers	15	76					
Students	21	40					
21. Allocation of student awards							
Admin.		33		44			
Teachers		34		32			
Students		33		38			

Table 38 (continued)

Decision Items	% of Chosen Decision-Making Group						
	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S
22. Selection of staff							
Admin.	56	33					
Teachers	60	24					
Students	61						
25. School drug policy							
Admin.	22	22					
Teachers	31	24	16				
Students	38	17	25				
26. Parental influence in the school							
Admin.		44		56			
Teachers	23	22		23			
Students		21		29			
27. Evaluation of Stu- dent Union Ad- visor							
Admin.	67						
Teachers	18			24			
Students				16		25	
28. Expenditure of School Board funds							
Admin.		55					
Teachers	32	55					
Students	47						
30. Student-choice of a teacher							
Admin.	44	33					
Teachers	38						
Students	49			16			

Decision Items 9, 23, 24, and 29 were not applicable to the Perceived Subscale.

Frequencies less than 15% were not reported.

Table 39

Percentage Distributions of Administrators, Teachers
and Students on the Preferred Subscale
(N=168)

Decision Items	% of Chosen Decision-Making Group						
	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S
1. Extent of knowledge to be taught							
Admin.		33		44	22		
Teachers		28		22	24	24	
Students		18		42	26		
2. Class size							
Admin.		67					
Teachers		65				16	
Students		27		25	25	17	
3. Homework frequency							
Admin.					22	67	
Teachers					37	51	
Students					57	18	
4. Extra-curriculum pro- gram							
Admin.				67	22		
Teachers				66			
Students				38			38
5. Selection of super- visors for student activities							
Admin.				78			
Teachers		18		55	18		
Students				29	23		38
6. Student body regula- tions							
Admin.				89			
Teachers				74			
Students			16	46	21		16

Table 39 (continued)

Decision Items	% of Chosen Decision-Making Group						
	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S
7. Evaluation of students							
Admin.				67			
Teachers	18				35	32	
Students					55	20	
8. Evaluation of teachers							
Admin.	22			56			
Teachers	32			42			
Students			33	21			25
9. Evaluation of administrators							
Admin.	22			67			
Teachers	34			37			
Students				30	52		
10. Attendance policy							
Admin.				89			
Teachers	42			42			
Students				33	38		17
11. Late policy							
Admin.				78			
Teachers	35			35		16	
Students				27	35		17
12. Student suspension							
Admin.	33			67			
Teachers	54			34			
Students				53	21		
13. Dismissal of a teacher							
Admin.	22	56		22			
Teachers	17	67					
Students	16	18	23	39			

Table 39 (continued)

Decision Items	% of Chosen Decision-Making Group						
	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S
14. Parental contact concerning student							
Admin.		56		44			
Teachers	15	55		24			
Students		21		35	21		
15. Classroom standards							
Admin.		33		44	22		
Teachers		16		26	28	31	
Students				21	49	16	
16. Student dress regulations							
Admin.				56			44
Teachers				54			18
Students				21			65
17. Student timetables							
Admin.	22	22		44			
Teachers	22	17	18	40			
Students			25	36			
18. Expenditure of Student Union funds							
Admin.				33	33		22
Teachers			27	45			
Students				30			51
19. Organization of staff meetings							
Admin.		67		33			
Teachers		85					
Students		71		20			

Table 39 (continued)

Decision Items	% of Chosen Decision-Making Group						
	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S
20. Subjects allotted to teachers							
Admin.		78		22			
Teachers		73				22	
Students		39		21		16	
21. Allocation of student awards							
Admin.				100			
Teachers		21		56			
Students		20		58			
22. Selection of a staff							
Admin.		89					
Teachers	37	55					
Students	33		23	33			
23. Student cabinet							
Admin.				78			
Teachers			23	48			18
Students			21	33			29
24. Staff cabinet							
Admin.		67		33			
Teachers		77					
Students		49		17		18	
25. School drug policy							
Admin.				89			
Teachers		27		67			
Students				70			
26. Parental influence in school							
Admin.				89			
Teachers		28		60			
Students				70			

Table 39 (continued)

Decision Items	% of Chosen Decision-Making Group						
	A	A-T	A-S	A-T-S	T-S	T	S
27. Evaluation of Student Union Advisor							
Admin.				67			
Teachers			17	57			
Students				33			44
28. Expenditure of School Board funds							
Admin.		56		33			
Teachers		79		16			
Students		21		58			
29. Selection of a principal							
Admin.	22	33		44			
Teachers	33	51					
Students	27			31	18		
30. Student-choice of a teacher							
Admin.	22			67			
Teachers	16	26		31			
Students			20	17	17		26

Frequencies less than 15% were not recorded.

B29999